NOT TO BE ISSUED
OUT OF THE LIBRARY.

00032390

BOMBAY BRANCH
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 25 June, 2016

IBBON's HISTORY

OF THE

DECLINE AND FALL

OF THE

ROMAN EMPIRE,

IN VOLS. IV, V, AND VI, QUARTO,

REVIEWED.

32-75

By the Rev. JOHN WHITAKER, B.D.

RECTOR OF RUAN-LANYHORNE, CORNWALL.

LONDON:
TED FOR J. MURRAY, N° 32, FLEET STREET.

M.DCC.XCI.

00032390

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE following remarks were drawn up by me, for inſertion in the ENGLISH REVIEW. *I am no reviewer by profeſſion. I became one in this inſtance, from a deſire of ſerving the cauſe of religion. And the remarks were publiſhed in that review, through a courſe of ten months. In a little time afterwards, I was adviſed by a nobleman of the firſt rank in reſpectability, and nearly the firſt in reality, to republiſh them in the preſent form. I propoſed the plan to my bookſeller the proprietor of the Review, and he demurred upon it. He found however afterwards, that the remarks were called for when the Reviews were no longer to be had. He now urged me himſelf, therefore, to an immediate republication of them. I reſolved to reviſe them for the purpoſe, and waited for an hour of leiſure to do ſo. That hour was long in coming. The republication has thus been delayed to the preſent moment. And I now prefix my name to the whole, in order to ſerve the ſame cauſe for which the whole was originally written. Religion (to uſe the alluſion, which I once heard from a witty man of genius) I hope, I ſhall always conſider as the 'Sanctum Punctum,' and learning only as the 'Glory' ſurrounding it.*

J. W.

March 3d, 1791.

ERRATA.

P. 6. l. 14. *for* cæli *read* Cæli.
P. 8. l. 14. *for* quidam *read* quidem.
——— l. 24. *for* in adſucto *read* in-adſueto.
P. 18. l. 21. *for* lives *read* loves.
P. 23. l. 21. *for* free *read* freſh.
P. 34. l. 27. *for* known *read* had.
P. 111. l. 25. *for* and is about *read* and about.
P. 112. l. 2. *for* Tacob *read* Jacob.
P. 115. l. 18. *for* its *read* his.
P. 181. l. 11. *for* vinea *read* vineas.
——— Note, l. 2. *for* ad *read* and.
P. 191. l. 22. *for* upon *read* up in.
P. 218. l. 23. *for* of *read* to.
P. 249. l. laſt. *for* ſtrange digreſſion *read* ſtrange ſyſtem of digreſſion.

TO THE BINDER.

Paſte this at the back of the Advertiſement, to face page 1.

REVIEW

OF

MR. GIBBON'S HISTORY, &c.

Gibbon's Hiſtory of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, in Volumes IVth, Vth, and VIth, Quarto.

CHAPTER FIRST.

IN the firſt rude ſtate of hiſtorical compoſition, it is a mere *intimation* of the *greater* facts. It notes the *battles* of contending nations; but it goes no farther. It points out no political cauſes, that led to this deciſion by the ſword. It indicates no political conſequences, that reſulted from the victory or the defeat. And it even gives no other circumſtances of facts, than to tell which of the parties won the day. This is the very *ſkeleton* of hiſtory; appearing at preſent in the *Saxon Chronicle* among ourſelves, and once appearing probably in thoſe firſt chroniclers of Rome, Fabius Pictor and others, who have ſince ſunk away in the meagerneſs of their own wretched annals, and in the plenitude of the ſucceeding hiſtories.

The next grand ſtage of improvement, is to *dwell* upon all the principal events of hiſtory; to draw out the train of cauſes preceding; and to link together the chain of conſequences following. It particularly loves to reſt upon thoſe ſplendid incidents of hiſtory, *battles*. It deſcribes them with a fulneſs and a circumſtantiality, that faſten upon the mind, and give it a kind of ſanguinary ſatisfaction. Such was the work of Cœlius among the Romans, we ſuppoſe; a writer, to whom Livy occaſionally refers, and one of the later chroniclers, from whom he compiled his hiſtory. And ſuch is *Baker's Chronicle* among ourſelves; that ſtanding mirror of hiſtory to our fathers, and now remembered with fondneſs by us as the delight of our childhood. This is the ſkeleton clothed with muſcles, ſupported by ſinews, and exhibiting the form and figure of hiſtory to the eye.

But this ſpecies of writing, by a regular gradation of improvement, afterwards aſſumes a higher port. It takes the incidents of the firſt ſtage, and the circumſtances of the ſecond. It combines cauſes, facts, and conſequences, in one regular order of ſucceſſion. It throws an illumination over the whole, by the clearneſs of its narration, the judiciouſneſs of its arrangement, and the elegance of its language. And it gives the reader an intereſt in the ſcenes before him, by the livelineſs with which it preſents them to his mind, and by the reflections with which it points them to his heart. Such is the hiſtory of Livy among the Romans, and ſuch are ſome of our *beſt* hiſtories written by the *laſt* generation. This is the ſkeleton not merely clothed with fleſh, but actuated with nerves, animated with blood, and bearing the bloom of health upon its cheek.

Here had hiſtorical compoſition reſted, it would have anſwered all the uſeful, and all the elegant, purpoſes of life. But the activity of the human mind, is always on the wing. The ſpirit of improvement is ever puſhing forward. And there is a degree of improvement beyond this, which may ſhed a greater warmth of colouring over the piece, give it a deeper intereſt with the affections of the ſurveyor, and ſo reach the full point of hiſtorical perfection. But alas! man can eaſily imagine, what he can never execute. The fancy can ſee a perfection, and the judgment can recommend it; but the hand cannot attain to it. Whether this be the caſe with the preſent idea of hiſtorical perfection, I know not; but it is certain, I think, that it has never been attained hitherto. Hiſtory, indeed, having once advanced to the third ſtage of improvement, cannot but ſtrain to reach the fourth and laſt. Then it lays itſelf out in a ſplendour of imagery, a frequency of reflections, and a refinement of language; and thus makes the narrative more ſtriking, by its additional vivacity and vigour. But it is melancholy to obſerve, that in proportion as we thus advance in the *ornamental* parts of hiſtorical writing, we are receding from the *ſolid* and the *neceſſary*; we loſe in *veracity* what we gain in *embelliſhments*; and the *authenticity* of the narration fades and ſinks away, in the luſtre of the *philoſophy* ſurrounding it. The mind of the writer, bent upon the beautiful and ſublime in hiſtory, does not condeſcend to perform the taſk of accuracy, and to ſtoop to the drudgery of faithfulneſs. The mirror is finely poliſhed and elegantly decorated; but it no longer reflects the real features of the times. The ſun ſhines out, indeed, with a ſtriking effulgence; but it is an effulgence of glare, and not a radiation of uſefulneſs. Such hiſtorians as theſe, we may venture to pronounce, are Tacitus among the ancients, moſt of our beſt hiſtorians in the *preſent* generation, and Mr. Gibbon at the head of them. And theſe preſent us with the ſkeleton of hiſtory, not merely clothed with muſcles, animated with life, and bearing the bloom of health upon its cheek; but, inſtead of carrying a higher fluſh of health upon its cheek, and ſhewing a brighter beam of life in its eyes, rubbed with Spaniſh wool, painted with French *fard*, and exhibiting the fire of falſehood and wantonneſs in its eyes.

That we ſhould thus rank Tacitus, may ſurpriſe thoſe who have *lately* been ſo much in the habit, of admiring and applauding him as the firſt of all human hiſtorians; and who may ſuppoſe he ſtands, like the other hiſtorians of the ancients, inveſted with oracular conſequence for facts, and incapable of being convicted of unfaithfulneſs from any cotemporary records. That he has been *lately* ra*ed beyond his merit, taken out of the real line in which he ought to ſtand, and transferred from the rank of *affected* and *fantaſtical* hiſtorians to that of the judicious and manly, has been long my perſuaſion.

ſuaſion. But I have lately met with an evidence, that ſhews him to us in a new light, as an hiſtorian *careleſs* and *unfaithful* in his repreſentations. This evidence has never yet been given to the world; but it is a very deciſive one. In 1528 were found within the earth at Lyons in France, two braſs plates, that had a ſpeech of the Emperor Claudius engraven upon them, and are now ſet up againſt the wall, in the veſtibule of the *Hotel de Ville* of Lyons. Theſe form a very ſingular object of curioſity, for the antiquary. But they are ſtill more curious to the hiſtorian. For this very ſpeech is pretended to be given by Tacitus; yet the ſpeech in the hiſtory is very different, from that upon the plates. And, as ſuch an opportunity of collating an ancient hiſtorian with a cotemporary monument, can ſeldom occur at all, and perhaps occurs only in this ſingle inſtance; as this opportunity has never yet been uſed by any writer; and as it ſhews the inaccuracy and unfaithfulneſs of Tacitus, in a ſtrong point of view; I doubt not but my readers will be pleaſed, to ſee the collation here.

"ORIGINAL.

'..... mae rerum noſtr ..... ſii .... equidem primam omnium, illam cogitationem hominum quâm maximé primam occurſuram mihi provideo. Deprecor ne quaſi novam iſtam rem introduci exhorreſcatis; ſed illa potiùs cogitetis, quâm multa in hâc civitate novata ſint; et quidem ſtatim ab origine urbis noſtræ, in quot formas ſtatuſque reſpublica noſtra diducta ſit.

'Quondam reges hanc tenuêre urbem. Ne tamen domeſticis ſucceſſoribus eam tradere contigit. Supervenêre alieni, et quidam externi: ut Numa Romulo ſucceſſerit, ex Sabinis veniens; vicinus quidem, ſed tunc externus: ut Anco Martio Priſcus Tarquinius, propter temeratum ſanguinem quód patre Demarato, Corinthio, natus erat, et Tarquinienſi matre, generoſâ ſed inopi, ut quæ tali marito neceſſe habuerit ſuccumbere, cúm domi repelleretur a gerendis honoribus. Poſtquam Romam migravit, regnum adeptus eſt. Huic quoque, et filio nepotive ejus (nam et hoc inter auctores diſcrepat), inſertus Servius Tullius; ſi noſtros ſequimur, captivâ natus Ocreſiâ, ſi Tuſcos, cæli quondam Vivennæ ſodalis fideliſſimus, omniſque ejus caſûs comes, poſtquam variâ fortunâ exactus, cum omnibus reliquiis Cæliani exercitûs Etruriâ exceſſit, montem Cælium occupavit, et a duce ſuo Cælio ita appellitatus, mutatoque nomine (nam Tuſcé Maſtarna ei nomen erat) ita appellatus eſt ut dixi, et regnum ſummâ cum reipublicæ utilitate optinuit. Deinde, poſtquam Tarquini Superbi mores inviſi civitati noſtræ eſſe cœperunt, quá ipſius quá filiorum ejus; nempe pertæſum eſt mentes regni, et ad conſules, annuos magiſtratus, adminiſtratio reipublicæ tranſlata eſt.

'Quid nunc commemorem dictaturæ, hôci pſo conſulari, imperium valentius repertum apud majores noſtros, quo in aſperioribus bellis, aut in civili motu difficiliore, uterentur; aut in auxilium plebis creatos, tribunos plebeios? Quid a conſulibus ad decemviros tranſlatum imperium; ſolutoque poſtea decemvirali regno, ad conſules rurſus reditum? Quid imp. . : . . Quinqueviris diſtributum conſulare imperium; tribunoſque militum conſulari imperio appellatos, qui ſeni, et ſæpe octoni, crearentur? Quid communicatos poſtremò cum plebe honores, non imperii ſolúm, ſed ſacerdotiorum quoque? Jam, ſi narrem bella a quibus cœperint majores noſtri, et quò proceſſerimus; vereor ne nimio inſolentior eſſe videar, et quæſiſſe jactationem gloriæ prolati imperii ultra oceanum. Sed illoc potiûs revertar. Civitatem . . . . . . ſane . . . . . . novo . . . . Divus Auguſtus . . . . . . no . . . . . lus et patruus, Ti. Cæſar, omnem florem ubique coloniarum ac municipiorum, bonorum ſcilicet virorum et locupletium, in hâc curiâ eſſe voluit. *Quid ergo non Italicus ſenator provinciali potior eſt?* Jam vobis cúm hanc partem Cenſuræ meæ approbare cœpero, quid de eâ re ſentiam rebus oſtendam. Sed ne provinciales quidem, ſi modó ornare curiam poterint, rejiciendos puto.

‘ Ornatiſſima ecce colonia valentiſſimaque Viennenſium! Quám longo jam tempore, ſenatores huic curiæ confert! Ex quâ coloniâ, inter paucos equeſtris ordinis ornamentum, L. Veſtinum familiariſſimé diligo, et hodieque in rebus meis detineo; cujus liberi fruantur, quæſo, primó ſacerdotiorum gradu, poſtmodó cum annis promoturi dignitatis ſuæ incrementa. Ut dirum nomen Latronis taceam, et odi illud paleſtricum prodigium, quod anté in domum conſulatum intulit, quám colonia ſua ſolidum civitatis Romanæ beneficium conſecuta eſt. Idem de fratre ejus poſſum dicere, miſerabili quidem indigniſſimoque hôc caſu, ut vobis utilis ſenator eſſe non poſſit.

' *Tempus eſt jam, Tiberi Cæſar Germanice, detegere te patribus conſcriptis, quo tendat oratio tua. Jam enim ad extremos fines Galliæ Narbonenſis veniſti.*

' Tot ecce inſignes juvenes! Quot intueor! Non magis ſunt pænitendi ſenatores, quám pænitet Perſicum, nobiliſſimum virum, amicum meum, inter imagines majorum ſuorum Allobrogici nomen legere. Quód ſi hæc ita eſſe conſentitis, quid ultra deſideratis, quám ut vobis digito demonſtrem, ſolum ipſum ultra fines provinciæ Narbonenſis jam vobis ſenatores mittere; quando *ex Lugduno habere nos noſtri ordinis viros non pænitet.* Timidé quidam, patres conſcripti, egreſſus adſuetos familiareſque vobis provinciarum terminos ſum; ſed deſtricté jam Comatæ Galliæ cauſa agenda eſt. In quâ ſiquis hoc intuetur, quód bello per decem annos exercuerunt divom Julium, idem opponat centum annorum immobilem fidem obſequiumque, multis trepidis rebus noſtris pluſquam expertum. Illi patri meo Druſo, Germaniam* ſubigenti, tutam quiete ſuâ ſecuramque a tergo pacem præſtiterunt; et quidem, cúm ad cenſus, novo tum opere et in adſueto Gallis, ad bellum avocatus eſſet. Quod opus quám arduum ſit, nobis nunc cúm maximé, quamvis nihil ultra quám ut publicé notæ ſint facultates noſtræ exquiratur, nimis magno experimento cognoſcimus.'

We have thus publiſhed a ſpeech, which has been preſerved by a fate peculiar to itſelf, in its own original paragraphs; and, for the firſt time, with modern punctuation, and with modern diſcrimination of *objections* from the reſt. But let us now turn to the

COPY IN TACITUS.

'Majores mei (quorum antiquiſſimus Clauſus, origine Sabinâ, ſimul in civitatem Romanam et in familias patriciorum aſcitus eſt) hortantur, uti paribus conſiliis rempublicam capeſſam, transferendo huc quod uſquam egregium fuerit. Neque enim ignoro Julios Albâ, Coruncanios Camerio, Porcios Tuſculo; et, ne vetera ſcrutemur, Etruriâ Lucaniâque et omni Italiâ, in ſenatum accitos. Poſtremó ipſam ad Alpes promotam, ut non modó ſinguli viritim, ſed terræ genteſque, in nomen noſtrum coaleſcerent. Tunc ſolida domi quies, et adverſus externa floruimus, cúm Tranſpadani in civitatem recepti; cúm, ſpecie deductarum per orbem terræ legionum, additis provincialium validiſſimis, feſſo imperio ſubventum eſt. Non pænitet Balbos ex Hiſpaniâ, nec minús inſignes viros e Galliâ Narbonenſi tranſiviſſe. Manent poſteri eorum, nec amore in hanc patriam nobis concedunt. Quid aliud exitio Lacedæmoniis et Athenienſibus fuit, quanquam armis pollerent; niſi quód victos pro alienigenis arcebant? At conditor noſter Romulus tantum ſapientiâ valuit, ut pleroſque populos eodem die hoſtes, dein cives, habuerit. *Advenæ in nos regnaverunt.* Libertinorum filiis magiſtratus mandari, non (ut plerique falluntur) repens, ſed priori populo, factitatum eſt. *At cum Senonibus pugnavimus.* Scilicet Volſci et Æqui nunquam adverſam nobis aciem

ſtruxere. *Capti a Gallis ſumus.* Sed et Tuſcis obſides dedimus, et Samnitium jugum ſubivimus. Attámen, ſi cuncta bella recenſeas, nullum breviore ſpatio quám adverſus Gallos confectum. *Continua deinde ac fida pax.* Jam moribus, artibus, affinitatibus, noſtris mixti, aurum et opes ſuas inferant potiús, quam ſeparati habeant. Omnia, patres conſcripti, quæ nunc vetúſtiſſima creduntur, nova fuere. *Plebei magiſtratus poſt patricios,* Latini poſt plebeios, ceterarum Italiæ gentium poſt Latinos. Inveteraſcet hoc quoque, et quod hodie exemplis tuemur inter exempla erit[1].'

The copy here is apparently very different from the original. We have noted in Italics the only points, in which it is at all ſimilar. The mock-ſun, we ſee, has caught only *three* rays of the real one. And Tacitus ſeems, like our own Dr. Johnſon, to have had ſome report of the real ſpeech made to him, and then to have fabricated another from the intimations. But the report made to Tacitus, was evidently a much ſlighter one than that to Dr. Johnſon. The doctor, we believe, always comprehended ſome of the leading topics of the reality, in his repreſentation; while Tacitus has merely *glanced* at what Claudius ſaid. And, whatever excuſe may be made for the Engliſhman, then, to the diſgrace of the reign of George the Second, reſiding 'in a garret behind Exeter-'Change;' compelled to procure himſelf a ſubſiſtence, by the exertion of his great powers; and naturally ſtudying to gratify that rage for reading parliamentary ſpeeches, which was then beginning to riſe in the nation, and has ſhot out to ſuch a wonderful extent ſince; yet, not a ſhadow of an excuſe can be made for Tacitus. The baſtard offspring in him, has ſcarcely any the fainteſt reſemblance of the legitimate. The ſpeeches of Johnſon, too, were evaneſcent in their nature, and would have evaporated and been loſt in air; had not the eſſence of them, a little rectified and heightened, been caught in his alembic. But the ſpeech of Claudius was actually recorded, was engraven upon plates of braſs, and hung up in the town-hall of Lyons, &c. Yet Tacitus did not give himſelf the trouble to procure a copy, when a copy was ſo eaſy to be had. He choſe rather to diſplay his abilities, in framing a new one for the emperor. He thus, in the unfaithfulneſs of his temper and in the vanity of his ſpirit, impoſed a fictitious ſpeech for a genuine one, upon the credulity of his reader. But he could not, like Johnſon, aſſimilate himſelf to the character of the ſpeaker, whom he perſonated. The ſpeech of Claudius is all in the ſtyle of Tacitus, briſk, brief, and compacted. And as this ſingle inſtance ſhews us in the plaineſt manner, from what ſource of information Tacitus derived all his ſet ſpeeches, thoſe numerous decorations of his hiſtory and annals, that all reflect ſtrongly the features of their common parent; ſo, in this particular inſtance, Tacitus appears to have given the lie to hiſtory and to himſelf, and to have furniſhed a man, whom he himſelf deſcribes to have been of a feeble underſtanding, 'imminuta mens[1],' with a ſpeech pointed, informed, and vigorous, Indeed, the ſuggeſted ſpeech is ſo nearly, in all its parts, different from the pronounced one, that ſome have ſuppoſed the one to have been never meant for the other; eſpecially as Tacitus directs *his* ſpeech in favour of all the extra-provincial Gauls in general, and of the *Ædui* in particular. But there is juſt ſimilarity enough, to evince the intended ſameneſs; even while the difference is great and ſtriking enough, to prove it an actual forgery. And his mention of the Ædui, is no evidence to the contrary at all; as theſe appear from Ptolemy, to have been the ſuperior lords of the Seguſiani, and ſo to have been the head-ſovereigns of their capital city—Lyons[2].

---

[1] Ann. xi. 24.

This forms a very extraordinary proof of the licentious hand, with which this 'philoſophical hiſtorian of antiquity,' as Mr. Gibbon calls him, has abuſed the honeſt confidence of hiſtory. He is apparently Mr. Gibbon's model in writing. Mr. Gibbon has *his* ſtrain of irreligion; *his* reſplendence of paſſages; *his* 'philoſophy of hiſtory;' and *his* unfaithfulneſs to the truth. And the laſt point, that 'crimen læſæ majeſtatis' in hiſtory has been proved ſo plainly upon him by the Rev. Mr. (now Archdeacon) Travis; and much more by that extraordinary young man, that early victim to ſtudiouſneſs, the late Mr. Davis of Baliol college in Oxford; as nothing ſhould ever efface from the mind of the public. Indeed the tone of opinion concerning Mr. Gibbon, has been deciſively ſettled among the diſcerning few; ever ſince Mr Davis wrote.

---

[1] Ann. vi. 46.

[2] Bertius, Lib. ii. c. 8. p. 52.

Mr. Gibbon has ever ſince been conſidered, as a writer who, whatever elſe he may have to recommend him to notice, wants that firſt grand quality of an hiſtorian, *veracity*. This defect, indeed, with the generality is of little moment. They read, but never examine; rely with an indecent kind of implicitneſs, on theſe dictators in hiſtory; and are delighted at once with the ſight and with the muſic, of theſe fairy ſcenes before them. But with others, with all who read to know truths, and with all whoſe good opinions are worth the having; this mere 'ſemblance of truth,' and this actual hollowneſs of falſehood, muſt hang upon the thought, muſt damp the ardour of praiſe, and poiſon admiration with ſuſpicion.

Nor has my own experience of Mr. Gibbon's preceding volumes, been different. I too have examined ſome of his authorities; and I too have found him, like Tacitus, taking great freedoms with them. I will produce an inſtance of this, that has not been noticed by any other writer, and has even no excuſe from the diſingenuity of prejudice. It is founded only, on the too natural careleſſneſs of a *philoſophical* hiſtorian; and occurs in his firſt volume. There, in p. xvii. of his notes on chapter the fifth, and in note 5, he places the Prætorian camp of Rome, 'cloſe to the walls of the city, and on the broad 'ſummit of the Quirinal and Viminal hills;' upon the authority of Nardini Roma Antica, p. 174, and Donatus de Româ Antiquâ, p. 46. I dwell not upon the groſs abſurdity, of placing one camp upon the ſummit of *two* hills; or on the grand error of fixing it upon the 'broad ſummit' of hills, one of which (the Quirinal) abuts ſo cloſe upon the capitol, and both had for ages been occupied with buildings. Our preſent buſineſs is not with miſtakes, but miſquotations. Nor does either of the authors here referred to, pitch the Prætorian camp upon 'the broad ſummit of the Quirinal and Viminal hills.' They both unite, inplacing it *beyond* 'the broad ſummit' of either, *beyond* the bank of Tarquin, on a *projecting point* of the Viminal hill, and in the ſtill remaining ſquare of walls *at the north-eaſtern angle of the city.* Donatus refers to ſome inſcriptions in Panvinius, dug up at the ground, and mentioning the camp expreſsly. And Nardini declares Panvinius, to have proved the point by the cleareſt arguments; and appeals to thoſe inſcriptions and that ſquareneſs, as a deciſive evidence concerning it[1]. So greatly inattentive has Mr. Gibbon here been, to the very teſtimony that he cites! So little can we depend upon his accuracy, even in ſubjects where he had *no bias of prejudice* to lead him aſtray! And ſo ſtrongly does this unite with all, which Mr. Davis, Mr. Travis, and others, have expoſed, of the ſame nature in his work!

This fundamental defect, that has been found in the preceding parts of his hiſtory, muſt act like a cancer in the human body, gradually be ſeen to ſpread its taint over all the vital parts, and eat away the ſubſtance of it in time. Where that grand principle of probity is wanting, *veracity*; the *man* or the *work* ſinks of courſe into contempt. And I have dwelt the more upon this neceſſary qualification for the hiſtorian, becauſe I think the public is running wild after the pomp and pageantry of hiſtory, and forgetting the only circumſtances that can ſupport them, accuracy of knowledge and integrity of repreſentation. But, before I cloſe theſe preliminary obſervations, I wiſh to ſubjoin two remarks, upon the *ſtyle* and the *arrangment* of Mr. Gibbon, in the antecedent volumes of his hiſtory.

---

[1] Grævius's Theſaurus, iii. 510 and 512—513, for Donatus; iv. 1065, 925, and 1082, for Nardini; and iii. 225—226, for Panvinius.

The ſtyle of Mr. Gibbon has been much applauded; nor would we wiſh to detract greatly from its merit. But it has been applauded beyond its deſert. It is often juſt, elegant, and manly; but is often alſo ſtiff, affected, and latiniſed, carrying the poor air of a tranſlation, and forming harſh and unclaſſical combinations of words. Thus no ſhield, we are told, could ſuſtain 'the impetuoſity 'of the weight' of the Roman pilum, when it was launched at the enemy [1]. It is not eaſy, we are alſo told, to 'appretiate the numbers in the Ro'man armies [2].' The ſavage independence of certain tribes, is ſaid to '*deſcribe* the doubtful li'mits of the Chriſtian and Mahometan power [3].' The Roman ſenators think it it an honour, and almoſt an obligation, to 'adorn the ſplendour' of their age and country[1]. We have perſons 'driven by the *impulſion* of the preſent power[2];' the command of the Prætorian guards, 'becoming into' the firſt office of the empire[3]; ſoldiers too little acquainted with certain virtues, 'to appretiate' them in others[4]; and the Germans abandoning 'the vaſt ſilence' of their woods[5], an expreſſion borrowed from Tacitus, who with his uſual harſhneſs of language, more than once expreſſes a deep ſilence by *vaſtum ſilentium*, and in Engliſh carrying an aſpect of boyiſh vulgarity. And as, in one place, we have even 'more inferior[6];' ſo we ſee that pert antitheſis every where affected by Mr. Gibbon, which is ſo unbecoming the dignified vivacity of hiſtory.

---

[1] V. i. p. 13. [2] p. 16. [3] p. 23.

But we have much more to cenſure, in Mr. Gibbon's arrangement of his materials. In page 1 of Vol. I. he ſets out with declaring, that 'it is the deſign of *this and the ſucceeding chapters*, to deſcribe the *proſperous* condition of the empire; and *afterwards*, from the death of Marcus Antoninus, to adduce the *moſt important circumſtances* of its *decline* and *fall*.' Let us therefore examine the chapters of this very volume, and ſee how the execution comports with the deſign.

Chapters fourth and fifth give us the hiſtory of the empire, under the reigns of Commodus, Pertinax, and Severus. The account is pleaſing and ſenſible, and the train of hiſtory judiciouſly dwelt

---

[1] p. 45. [2] p. 122. [3] p. 127. [4] p. 172. [5] p. 227. [6] p. 272.

†

upon. But how are the principles of the decline and fall of the empire, at all unfolded in this account? How are they, in chapters ſixth and ſeventh? Theſe purſue the hiſtory through the elevation of Maximus, Balbinus, and the third Gordian, the deaths of the three Gordians, and the acceſſion of Philip. And where is the *decline* and *fall* of the empire, in all this? *Nowhere.* We are reading the full hiſtory of the empire. We ſee nothing of its beginning to decline; we think nothing of its approaching fall; and this fall and decline are in reality not one degree more advanced, at the end of the ſeventh chapter, than they were at the beginning of the fourth. The chapters ſince, have only ſerved to ſhew what the elevation of Galba, Otho, Vitellius, and Veſpaſian, had ſhewn ſtrongly before, the arrogated ſuperiority of the military over the civil power; and what the putting up of the throne to *auction* evinced more ſtrikingly afterwards, the peculiar inſolence of the Prætorian guards. All theſe chapters, therefore, ſhould have been omitted; as, if proper in themſelves, not giving us ‘ the important circumſtances’ of the empire's decline and fall, but *all* the circumſtances of *all* the hiſtory; and as not very proper in themſelves, as foreign to the deſign, and ſuperfluous in the execution, of ſuch a hiſtory. And we can only travel on in the work, ſenſible that ſo far we have been wandering out of our way; and hoping immediately to recover the right path, and purſue it ſteadily to the end of the volume.

Accordingly we enter upon the eighth chapter; but find ourſelves diverted into an account of the riſe, the principles, and the ſpirit, of the new Perſian empire erected upon the Parthian. But how does this link connect itſelf, with the chain of declining empire at Rome? Only thus; a new enemy appears againſt the Romans, under the revived title of Perſians. This is all the connexion, which it has with the hiſtory of the decline and fall of the empire. And, holding by this ſlender thread, does the author divert from the whole courſe of his hiſtory here; and wander away to deſcribe an empire, that was only the old one under a new name. And his additional digreſſion into a delineation of the Perſian *religion*, is a ſtriking proof of the injudicioufneſs of his management. This religion has not the ſmalleſt influence upon the hiſtory; it ought not therefore to have been dwelt upon by the hiſtorian. But ſuch juſt laws of writing hiſtory, do not ſuit with the excentric genius of Mr. Gibbon. He lives to make excurſions into geography, into metaphyſics, into religion; and is always aiming a ſide-blow at Chriſtianity. He has thus introduced into his hiſtory, a diſſertation upon the Perſian religion; which is all a maſs of impertinence in itſelf, as a part of his hiſtory; and, as containing ſtrokes of indirect attack upon Chriſtianity, is much worſe than impertinence, the impotent exertions of an infant againſt a giant.

In the ſame ſtrain of excentricity Mr. Gibbon, in chapter ninth, again burſts from the orbit of his hiſtory, and ranges into the interiors of Germany. He delineates the ſtate of Germany before the reign of Decius; but his delineation is principally taken from Tacitus, *who wrote one hundred and fifty years before.* Nor can his account, ſo large as it is, be conſidered in any other light, than as an ill-judged excreſcence upon the body of his work. Mr. Gibbon, either in a great want of judgment, or in a bravery of ſpirit that loves not to be controled by it, leaps over all the fences and bounds of legitimate hiſtory, and gives himſelf a free range in the wilds adjoining. And, in this mode of writing the hiſtory of the decline and fall of the empire, the author may leave his hiſtory perpetually, and *make the circuit of the globe*, in deſcribing, delineating, and moraliſing upon, all the nations that form the frontier of the empire. Common-ſenſe ſhews us, that ſuch a conduct as Mr. Gibbon purſues is infinitely abſurd; that a very different one ſhould have been adopted by him; and that, as any new nations emerged to view in the current of the hiſtory, a ſhort pauſe ſhould have been made in the narration, the power, the ſkill, and the ſpirit of the ſtrangers, ſhould have been briefly and generally explained, and any qualities beſides, that were neceſſary to the better underſtanding of the ſubſequent facts. All the other parts of their character, ſhould have been left to diſplay themſelves by degrees, in the train of the military operations. Thus the ſtream of the hiſtory would have been ſuſpended, only for a ſhort period, for an obvious purpoſe, and for neceſſary information; and would then have reſumed its courſe, with the more force for the interruption. And theſe long and rambling diſſertations of Mr. Gibbon, in which we loſe ſight of the decline and fall of the empire, and behind which even the whole empire itſelf diſappears from our view; would have been totally precluded.

In chapter tenth, Mr. Gibbon returns from his philoſophical and geographical excurſions, to his hiſtory. He now gives us an account of the attacks made upon the empire, by the Goths, the Franks, and the Perſians, in the reigns of Decius and others, to the reign of Gallienus; of the Goths and Franks; and of the riſe of what are called the thirty tyrants. The hiſtory becomes tireſome, from its minuteneſs. And we ſtill find ourſelves graſping the whole vaſt bulk of the Roman hiſtory, inſtead of the mere hiſtory of its decline and fall.

In chapter the eleventh, we find ourſelves more deluded than ever concerning the expected decline of the empire. This deſcribes to us *the reſtoration* of the empire, made by Claudius and Aurelian, In all the preceding chapters indeed, we have not ſeen ourſelves one foot nearer to the great cauſes and principles, that begun the decline, and terminated in the fall, of the empire. The civil wars of the firſt century, were to the full as deſtructive as thoſe of the ſecond and third. And *now* the bad effects of the reigns preceding, appear to be *cured* by the preſent reigns. So groſsly injudicious is the *progreſs* of the hiſtory!

But chapter twelfth continues the detail, to the elevation of Diocleſian. Then we ſee ourſelves ſtill farther off, from the decline and fall of the empire. The reſtoration of it by Claudius and Aurelian, is improved by Probus, and is purſued by Carinus. And the hiſtory is going moſt abſurdly *retrograde in its motions*;

Downwards to climb, and backwards to advance.

Chapter thirteenth carries on the detail, to the abdication of Diocleſian. But we have the ſame complaint to make here, which we have repeated ſo often before. Except in ſome *reflections* at the end of the chapter, we ſee no ſymptons in the hiſtory, of that decline and fall for which we have been preparing our minds ſo long. We ſee, indeed, the very contrary. The vigour of the preceding emperors is kept up by Diocleſian, and the empire is *conſiderably enlarged* to the *eaſt*. Thus, as far as the facts which Mr. Gibbon lays before us, can give us an inſight into the preſent ſtate of the empire; we, who were called to the ſickneſs, the death, and the burial of it, find ourſelves employed by our inviter, in tracing the *grandeur*, and in following up the *enlargement*, of it. If theſe facts are not deciſive evidences of its preſent ſtate, what facts can be? And, if they are, why in the name of common-ſenſe are they related by Mr. Gibbon?

Chapter fourteenth proſecutes the hiſtory, to the elevation of Conſtantine. Nor can we yet forbear the ſame complaint. We are not yet one inch nearer to the decline and fall of the empire, from any of the facts ſo particularly recited here. We have only a tax impoſed upon Italy, a country that had long been exempt from taxes, which could have no influence upon the duration or ſtability of the whole ſtate; and a repetition of thoſe civil wars, which had ſubſiſted as frequently and as deſtructively before, and of which if the mere repetition could give them a place in his hiſtory, as weakening more and more the internal reſources of the country, he ought to have equally taken in thoſe of Veſpaſian, Vitellius, Otho, and Galba, and ſo begun with the beginnings of the empire. And, by a ſingular addition to the continued injudiciouſneſs before, at the cloſe of this chapter we ſee the decline and fall of the empire, farther removed from us than it was at the end of the laſt. The plan of government begun by Diocleſian, and purſued to the preſent period, that of creating two emperors, and appointing two delegates under them; is now all overthrown. And the many dangers that threatened to reſult from it, are now all precluded by the exaltation of Conſtantine to the whole undivided empire.

Chapter fifteenth forms another digreſſion. For the laſt five chapters, Mr. Gibbon has kept with ſome regularity to the clue of hiſtory; though it is a hiſtory of facts, all alien from the purpoſe of his work, and indeed ſhewing the very reverſe of what he means to ſhew. But he here reſumes his *exorbitant* love of digreſſion, diſſertation, and philoſophiſing. He here rambles away from his hiſtory, to trace through a length of labyrinths the progreſs of Chriſtianity in the empire, before the Converſion of Conſtantine. In the general hiſtory of the empire, this departure of the emperor from the old faith to a new religion, is undoubtedly a very memorable incident, that ought to be explained at full length, becauſe of its conſequences to the ſtate. But, in a hiſtory of "the decline and fall" only of the empire, it is of little or no conſequence. The ſecret or open diffuſion of this new religion, had not the ſlighteſt influence upon the general fabric; ſo as to bring on a decline, or to haſten a fall. It ſapped none of its political foundations. It tore down none of its political pillars. It even muſt have had a very contrary effect; a tendency to ſupport the ſuperſtructure, by ſtrengthening the foundations. It introduced a ſtricter and ſeverer morality, among the great body of its ſubjects. And it thus tended greatly, to recall the beſt manners of the republic; to heighten them infinitely, in their comprehenſion and efficacy; ſo to renew with an addition of energy, the vital ſpirit of the whole empire; and to give it a free and ſupernatural principle of ſeminal vigour, So progreſſively injudicious and abſurd, is the conduct of this hiſtory! So much does one chapter riſe ſuperior to another, in contrariety to its deſign, and in prepoſterouſneſs from its own execution!

We thus reach chapter the ſixteenth and laſt. This ſhews us the conduct of the emperors towards the riſing religion of Chriſtianity, from Nero down to Conſtantine; and is merely an account of the Ten Perſecutions, as they are generally called. But let us aſk once more, What concern has all this with the decline and fall of the empire? The ſubject, with which we ſet out, is all gone from our view. It is whirled away as by the force of magic. And we have been wandering into a mixed wilderneſs of facts and ſpeculations, that relate only to the change of its religion. Inſtead of a regular hiſtory of facts, that point out the principles of diſſolution in the empire, and explain the progreſs of their operation on the body politic of Rome; we are treated with a *diſſertation on eccleſiaſtical hiſtory*, and a diſſertation calculated only by a miſrepreſentation of facts, and a falſification of ſentiments, by ſly touches of ſarcaſm at one time, and by bolder ſtrokes of effrontery at another, to reſtore the ſottiſhneſs of Paganiſm upon the ruins of Chriſtianity; to tear down this *ſun of the human ſyſtem* from its ſphere in the univerſe, and ſo reduce the moral world into its ancient chaos again.

From this uſeful analyſis of the firſt volume, we ſee the general folly of it in a glaring light. The whole is evidently in one groſs contradiction to its prefixed title, and in one continued violation of its profeſſed deſign. And having thus laid before my readers my ideas, with regard to the matter and the manner of Mr. Gibbon in the previous volumes of his hiſtory, by a pretty full diſſection of the firſt of them; I ſhall now proceed, to a conſideration of the preſent volumes.

CHAPTER THE SECOND.

IN the general preface to theſe three volumes, I meet with the following paſſage; which claims a particular notice from me..

'Were I ambitious of any other patron than the public,' ſays Mr. Gibbon, 'I would inſcribe this work to a ſtateſman, who, in a long, a ſtormy, and at length an unfortunate adminiſtration, had many political opponents, almoſt without a perſonal enemy; who has retained, in his fall from power, many faithful and diſintereſted friends; and who, under the preſſure of ſevere infirmity, enjoys the lively vigour of his mind, and the felicity of his incomparable temper. LORD NORTH will permit me to expreſs the feelings of friendſhip, in the language of truth; but even truth and friendſhip ſhould be ſilent, if he ſtill diſpenſed the favours of the crown.'

This is ſeemingly well ſaid. In appearance it does honour to Lord North, and honour to Mr. Gibbon. And it ſtrongly reminds us of that honeſt burſt of generoſity in Mr. Pope, amidſt all the cunning and meanneſs of his artificial character; when, in 1721, he addreſſed the Earl of Oxford in the following lines:

In vain to deſerts thy retreat is made,
The muſe attends thee to the ſilent ſhade:
'Tis hers the brave man's lateſt ſteps to trace,
Rejudge his acts, and dignify diſgrace.
When int'reſt calls off all her ſneaking train,
And all th' oblig'd deſert, and all the vain;
She waits or to the ſcaffold or the cell,
When the laſt ling'ring friend has bid farewell,
Ev'n now ſhe ſhades thy ev'ning walk with bays,
(No hireling ſhe, no proſtitute to praiſe);
Ev'n now, obſervant of the parting ray,
Eyes the calm ſun-ſet of thy various day;
Thro' fortune's cloud one truly great can ſee,
Nor fears to tell that MORTIMER is he.

Here we ſee the poet and the hiſtorian ſeemingly contending with each other, in delicacy of attention to their own honour, and in dignity of ſentiment towards an ejected miniſter. But Mr. Gibbon's apparent generoſity of conduct, loſes all its force with thoſe; who know the original enmity of his ſpirit to Lord North, and the ſudden converſion of that enmity into friendſhip. And I therefore lay the following anecdote before my readers, aſſuring them that I firmly believe it to be all true. In June 1781 Mr. Fox's library came to be ſold. Amongſt his other books, the firſt volume of Mr. Gibbon's hiſtory was brought to the hammer. In the blank leaf of this was a note, in the handwriting of Mr. Fox; ſtating a remarkable declaration of our hiſtorian at a well-known tavern in Pall-Mall, and contraſting it with Mr. Gibbon's political conduct afterwards. ' The author,' it obſerved, ' at Brookes's ſaid, That *there was no* ' *ſalvation for this country,* until SIX HEADS of the

'PRINCIPAL perſons in adminiſtration,' LORD NORTH being then prime miniſter, 'WERE LAID 'UPON THE TABLE. Yet,' as the obſervation added, '*eleven* days afterwards, this ſame gentle-'man *accepted a place of a lord of trade* under thoſe 'very miniſters, and *has acted with them ever* '*ſince*.' This extraordinary anecdote, thus recorded, very naturally excited the attention of the purchaſers. Numbers wiſhed to have in their own poſſeſſion, ſuch an *honourable* teſtimony from Mr. Fox, in *favour* of Mr. Gibbon. The contention for it roſe to a conſiderable height. And the volume, by the aid of this manuſcript addition to it, was ſold for three guineas. From ſuch a ſtate of ſavage hoſtility in Mr. Gibbon, did the rod of this miniſterial Hermes charm him down, in *eleven days* only; and change the man who ſtood, as it were, with his axe in his hand, ready to behead him and five of his aſſociates, into a ſure friend; a friend *in* power; and—now the ſpirit of ambition is forced to ſleep in the breaſt of Mr. Gibbon, and he himſelf is to obliged to retire into Switzerland, a friend *out* of it.

The FIRST chapter of this volume [chap. thirty-ninth in the ſeries of the volumes] contains the hiſtory of Theodoric, the Gothic ſovereign of Italy. But the hiſtory *at firſt* is ſo broken, ſhort, and unintereſting; that the reader becomes tired at the very outſet. This ariſes principally, we believe, from the imperfectneſs of the original notices. Yet, from whatever it ariſes, it has a very unpropitious influence upon the preſent chapter.

We ſee a ſet of barbarians moving before us, of whom we know little, and for whom we care leſs; doing nothing, either to attract our attention or to provoke our regard. This diſguſt, however, goes off by degrees. Theodoric, reigning peaceably in Italy, becomes in ſome meaſure a favourite with us; and the deaths of Boethius and Symmachus intereſt us in their favour.

In one place Nardini is cited for ſaying, what he does not ſay. 'Theſe horſes of Monte Cavallo' 'at Rome,' Mr. Gibbon tell us in a note, 'had 'been tranſported from Alexandria to the baths of 'Conſtantine (Nardini, p. 188)[1].' Yet, what are the very words of Nardini? I have not the original Italian by me; but in Græviu's tranſlation of the work into Latin, they are theſe: '*Panvinius*, parte primâ de Rep. Romanâ, a Conſtantino Alexandriâ deportatos *aſſerit*, et in Thermis 'ejus poſitos; quod *vero proximum videtur*[2].' Nardini, we ſee, does not aſſert the point himſelf; he only cites Panvinius for aſſerting it. And this aſſertion, he adds, 'ſeems to be *neareſt to the* '*truth*.' We mention not this inſtance, as any ſtriking deviation in Mr. Gibbon from his cited authorities. We notice it only as a ſmall one; as a ſlight evidence of that want of accuracy in him, which we marked in the firſt volume. And a trifling one of this nature, where no prejudice could interpoſe, and no unfaithfulneſs take place, is the beſt evidence of the general inaccuracy of his references.

---

[1] p. 26. [2] Grævius, iv. 1098.

In another place Mr. Gibbon ſpeaks of Ennodius, as ‘ the biſhop of Pavia; I mean the ecclesiaſtic who wiſhed to be a biſhop[1].’ This is ſo darkly worded, that it leaves the reader without a meaning. Nor can he underſtand it, till he comes to a ſubſequent page. There he finds that, ‘ two ‘ or three years afterwards, the orator [Ennodius] ‘ was rewarded with the biſhopric of Pavia[2].’ And then, for the firſt time, he obſerves that Mr. Gibbon intended to tell us before, Ennodius was *then* ſeeking the biſhopric which he *now* obtained.——‘ Theodoric's march’ is ſaid to be ‘ *ſupplied* and illuſtrated by Ennodius[3];’ where the author means, that the *account* of it is ‘ ſupplied,’ and the *courſe* of it ‘ illuſtrated,’ by Ennodius.——The wife or concubine of Theodoric is ſaid, to have met his flying troops at the entrance of their camp, and to have turned them back by her reproaches. ‘ She preſented, and almoſt ‘ diſplayed,’ adds a note, ‘ the original receſs[4].’ Here the obſcurity may be pardoned perhaps, for the ſake of the modeſty. But the modeſty might have been retained, and the obſcurity avoided. It is in that page, where we note ‘ the indecency of the ‘ women on the ramparts, who had revealed their ‘ moſt ſecret charms to the eyes of the aſſailants[5].’ ——He mentions ‘ the volume of public epiſtles, ‘ compoſed by Caſſiodorus in the royal name,’ as ‘ having obtained *more implicit credit* than they ‘ ſeem to *deſerve*[6].’ Yet, throughout the whole chapter afterwards[1], he builds his hiſtory upon the groundwork of theſe very epiſtles; without *one* hint of doubt concerning the author's knowledge, and without *one* ſhadow of derogation from his veracity.——We have alſo this *petty* ſtroke of arrogance: 'I will neither *hear* nor reconcile the 'arguments,' &c.[2]——Theodoric is ſaid to have 'loved, the virtues *which he poſſeſſed*, and the 'talents of which he was deſtitute[3].' The meaning is obſcured by the defect in the language. The ſentence ſhould have ſaid, that he 'loved' *in others* 'the virtues which he poſſeſſed' *himſelf*, &c.——Theodoric is likewiſe ſaid very harſhly, to have '*imprinted the footſteps* of a conqueror on the Capitoline hill[4];' when he ſhould have been declared only, to have *ſet the foot* of a conqueror upon it. In the ſame page Mr. Gibbon ſpeaks thus, concerning the cloacæ or common-ſewers at Rome: 'How ſuch works could be executed by 'a king of Rome, is yet a problem.' This is not ill ſaid; but the obſervation ought to have been carried much farther. Hiſtorical ſcepticiſm is the natural exertion, of a mind vigorous and thinking; while the ſcepticiſm of religion, is the mark generally of a head enſlaved to the tyranny of the paſſions, and reduced by it into a religious debility. In reading the *earlier* annals of the Romans, we meet with incidents that no *ſober* credulity can admit.

---

[1] p. 3. [2] p. 13. [3] p. 10. [4] p. 14.
[5] p. 108—109. [6] p. 13—14.

---

[1] In pages 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 31, 34, 37, 40, and 41.

[2] p. 21. [3] p. 23. [4] p. 25.

mit. We ſee a city, that was reared only by a few fugitives, in the ſpace only of *five* reigns become ſo exceedingly populous, according to the *beſt* and *oldeſt* accounts of the Romans themſelves; as to contain within it *eighty thouſand men capable of bearing arms*[1]; and conſequently, of all ages, not leſs than *four or five hundred thouſand perſons*. And, in the reign immediately *preceding*, we ſee thoſe ſewers conſtructed, which exiſted in the days of Pliny the admiration of the *imperial* Romans; which continue the wonder of all the curious world, to this day; and the cleanſing and repairing of which, when they had been once neglected and choaked, coſt the Romans no leſs than *a thouſand talents*[2], or about *two hundred thouſand pounds* of our money. Theſe hiſtorical *miracles*, having no *ſupernatural* authority to atteſt them, carry ſuch a monſtrous incredibility with them; as muſt overſet every common meaſure of faith, and ſhock even credulity itſelf.

The Second

chapter, or chapter fortieth, is an account of Juſtinian and his queen, his court, his fortreſſes, his introduction of ſilk-worms, his ſuppreſſion of the ſchools at Athens, his ending the ſucceſſion of conſuls at Rome, &c. &c. &c. But, in all this accumulation of miſcellaneous matter, how do we trace the decline and fall of the empire? Except in ſome incidental points concerning his fortreſſes, we ſee nothing in the whole, that marks with the ſlighteſt line of fact the falling, or even the declining, frame of the empire. And, in the ſecond page of the firſt volume, we were aſſured that we ſhould have only 'the moſt important circumſtances of its decline and fall.' So different from the promiſe is the performance! And ſo forgetful is the author of his own purpoſe and plan!

---

[1] Livy, i. 44. from Fabius Pictor.

[2] Grævius, iii. 777.

The manner too is full of ſhort, quick turns, that give us the pointed brevity, and frequent obſcurity of Tacitus. Theſe repeatedly ſtop the advance of the reader. He is obliged to pauſe and examine, before he can proceed. And theſe frequent *rubs* in the courſe of the reading, give a diſagreeableneſs to the movements of the hiſtory. The author alſo adds to this diſagreeableneſs, by another circumſtance in his conduct. He writes frequently to *his own ideas* only; and reflects not on the ideas of his reader. He therefore throws out alluſions, that are not underſtood as they ariſe, that perplex the memory, and that embarraſs the judgment. And the narration, if narration it can be called, is ſtill uninteresting. It has, indeed, too much of *diſſertation* in it. The whole is little more, than *a diſſertation upon the hiſtory*. And it is this, which gives a languor and a feebleneſs to the pages, that the incidents of hiſtory would not have given.

In one page, Mr. Gibbon lays open the laſcivious character of Theodora, the queen of Juſtinian. He gives us indeed the moſt notorious acts of her profligacy, as he ſays himſelf, 'veiled in the obſcurity of a learned language[1].' But he produces the paſſages at full length, when he needed only to have hinted at them; and when a modeſt man would have done ſo. He even gives us a repetition of paſſages. This ſhews his heart to have been delighted with the ſubject. And he even ſubjoins a note in Engliſh to one of them, in order to point it out more fully to the notice of his reader.

---

[1] P. 53.

The language has the ſame faults as before. Proclus is 'the friend of Juſtinian, and the enemy of every other adoption [1];' that is, an enemy to the adoption of any other perſon as heir to the empire. ——We have alſo theſe words: 'their religion, an 'honourable problem, betrays occaſional conformity, with a ſecret attachment to paganiſm [2].' What is an honourable problem? Their 'occa'ſional conformity to Chriſtianity,' with their 'ſecret attachment' to paganiſm? But how is this 'honourable?' And if ſo, how is it a 'problem?' ——He ſpeaks of the prieſts and their relics, which had been interpoſed between two parties of combatants, in order to ſeparate *them*; as 'interpoſed to '*ſeparate* the bloody *conflict*' itſelf [3].——He calls the web of the ſilkworm, its '*golden* tomb [4].' He repeatedly ſpeaks of 'the *education*' of *ſilkworms* [5]; and calls the ſtraits of Boſphorus and the Helleſpont, without any qualifying expreſſion, 'the gates of the 'city' Conſtantinople [6].——He ſays, 'a whole 'people, the manufacturers of Tyre and Berytus, '*was* reduced to extreme miſery [7].'——He mentions a man, whoſe '*ſtyle* was ſcarcely *legible* [8].'

---

[1] P. 45. [2] p. 48. [3] p. 67. [4] p. 71. [5] p. 78. [6] ibid. [7] p. 84. [8] p. 86.

A plan is ſaid to be 'deſcribed[1],' when the author means *drawn.*——Xenophon, we are told, '*ſuppoſes* in his romance the ſame barbarians, 'againſt whom he had fought in his retreat[2].'——We are informed, that the Athenians, 'about thirty 'thouſand males, *condenſed* within the period of a 'ſingle life the' genius of ages and millions[3].'——And finally,' ſays Mr. Gibbon, 'I *regret this* '*chronology,* ſo far preferable,' &c[4]. when he ought to have ſaid, 'I regret the *diſuſe* of this chrono'logy,' &c.

'I regret [the diſuſe of] this chronology,' of computing from the creation of the world, 'ſo far 'preferable to our double and perplexed method, 'of counting backwards and forwards the years 'before and after the Chriſtian æra.' Mr. Gibbon then adds, as many authors have added before him, that 'in the Weſt, the Chriſtian æra was firſt in'vented in the ſixth century;' and that 'it was 'propagated in the eighth by the authority and 'writings of venerable Bede[5].' The aſſertion concerning Bede, as if he was the firſt who uſed the Chriſtian æra, is ſurely as falſe as it is common. Bede only uſed the æra, *as others had uſed it before him.* His 'authority,' therefore, did not recommend it to the world. A Saxon of Northumbria was not likely, to have known ſuch an 'authority.' He found it already 'propagated.' It came recommended to him, by the 'authority' of the preceding uſers. And he accordingly uſes it in his

---

[1] P. 93. [2] p. 105. [3] p. 112. [4] p. 121. [5] ibid.

Chronicon, *without the leaſt notice previouſly concerning it*, as what was *common to the writers*, and *familiar to the readers*, of his age and country; coupling it as it had been uſed to be coupled, with the antecedent æra of the creation of the world. In this manner he enters upon what he calls his

'Anno 'Mundi	Chriſti	'SEXTA ÆTAS;
'3952.	1.	Anno Cæſaris Auguſti—, Jeſus Chriſtus, filius Dei, ſextam 'mundi ætatem ſuo conſe'cravit adventu [1].'

Firſt invented by Dionyſius Exiguus in 525, it was ſoon adopted, no doubt, as an uſeful *hinge* of chronology, upon which it could conveniently turn, to look either backward or forward; became *general* upon the *continent*, in conjunction with the old one; and *therefore* was uſed by Bede in this iſland, with all that apparent eaſe, with which our modern writers uſe it at preſent.

Mr. Gibbon ſpeaks of that aſſerted repetition of Archimedes's burning-glaſſes by Proclus, in theſe terms: 'A machine was fixed on the walls of 'the city, conſiſting of an HEXAGON mirror of po'liſhed braſs,' &c. And the note annexed tells us, that 'Tzetzes deſcribes the artifice of theſe 'burning-glaſſes [2].' Mr. Gibbon therefore refers to Tzetzes, for his account of them. Yet an unlucky blunder in his *real* author, detects his deluſive reference to the *nominal* one. The words of Tzetzes are theſe:

---

[1] Smith's Opera Bedæ, p. 16.

[2] p. 89.

> Ως Μαρκελλος δ' απεστησε βολην εκεινας τοξȣ,
> Εξαγων οντι κατοπτρον ετεκτηνεν ο γερων.

which, tranſlated, run thus;

> When Marcellus removed the ſhips a bow-ſhot off,
> Old Archimedes actually brought out a mirror and fixed it.

But where is this mirror ſaid to be, as Mr. Gibbon denominates it, an 'hexagon?' In theſe very lines, *as Mr. Gibbon renders them.* The word εξαγων in the ſecond line, he conſiders as εξαγωνος; and the *production* of the mirror he interprets into the *ſexangular* nature of it. Nor is this all. The blunder is not *his own*; he derives it from the hand of another. M. de Buffon, ſays Mr. Dutens, 'relating this paſſage in his Memoirs of the Academy 'for the year 1747, p. 99, ſpeaks of a hexagon 'mirror, though Tzetzes mentions no ſuch thing; 'that celebrated academician, or the perſon who 'communicated to him this paſſage, certainly 'miſtook the word εξαγων, which ſignifies *educens*, 'for εξαγωνος, a hexagon[1].' And, as this produces a moſt ridiculous proof of the ignorance of M. Buffon and of Mr. Gibbon in that very language of Greek which they pretend to tranſlate; ſo it ſhews Mr. Gibbon in a ſtill more ridiculous light to us, citing Buffon though he refers to Tzetzes, conſtruing Tzetzes only by the tranſlation of Buffon, and expoſing his mode of managing his quotations in general, by this detected inſtance of his conduct.

---

[1] Dutens's Inquiries into the Diſcoveries attributed to the Moderns. London, 1769, p. 325—326.

The

The THIRD,
or forty-firſt chapter.—Mr. Gibbon having, in the the three firſt volumes, deduced the hiſtory of the empire to its fall in the *Weſt*, was now to purſue it to its equal fall in the *Eaſt*. But does he do ſo? No. The very firſt chapter of this volume, carries us directly back into the Weſt again. It takes us even into Italy. It there gives us the *ſubſequent* hiſtory, of the late capital of the Weſt; its hiſtory, *after* it has *ceaſed* to be the capital, when it is no longer the metropolis even of Italy itſelf, and when it only ranks as ſecond to Ravenna. This *poſt-obit* kind of hiſtory is exceedingly ſtrange. It ſhews the hiſtorian, to have either fixed no limits to his excurſions, or to have ſlighted them. But he had firſt fixed and then ſlighted. In the preface to this very volume he ſays, that he 'now diſcharges his *promiſe*, and com-'pletes his *deſign*, of writing the hiſtory of the *de-'cline* and *fall* of the Roman empire, both in the '*Weſt* and the *Eaſt*.' Yet, in his very firſt chapter afterwards, he gives us a long account of what happened in the Weſt, in Italy, and at Rome; when the empire had already declined and fallen there. His whole chapter is a detail of events, in which the Roman empire had not the ſlighteſt concern; as they are merely the hiſtory of thoſe, who had previouſly pulled down the weſtern empire, and merely the victories of thoſe, who now conquered the conquerors of the empire. But this third chapter at once partakes in the fault of the firſt, and varies it conſiderably. It relates the tranſactions of Beliſarius, in reducing thoſe who

had rent Carthage and Italy from the weſtern empire, and in annexing both again to the eaſtern. We thus ſee the *decline* and *fall* of the empire all in an *inverted* poſition. We behold that very empire of the Weſt, which we had piouſly buried in the grave, and over which we had ſung a melancholy *requiem*; raiſed by the hand of miraculous violence from the earth, and brought upon the ſtage again. And nothing ſurely can equal the abſurdity of this conduct in the hiſtorian, except that dramatical ſtroke of Dryden's, in which one of the *ſtage-dead* cries out to the man who would have carried him off;

> ———— Hold, you damn'd confounded dog,
> I am to *riſe* and *ſpeak the epilogue.*

We are told, that the Goths and Vandals had obtained 'a legal eſtabliſhment' in Italy and Africa; and that 'the *titles* which Roman victory had *in-* '*ſcribed*, were eraſed with equal juſtice by the ſword 'of the barbarians [1].' Here we have a remarkable equivocation, in the uſe of a ſingle word. *Title* is uſed by the author for an *inſcription*, when he actually means a *right*.——We hear of 'a deep 'trench, which was *prolonged* at firſt in *perpendicu-* '*lar*, and afterwards in parallel, lines, to cover the 'wings of an army [2].' What is the *prolongation* of a trench in *perpendicular*, as oppoſed to *parallel*, lines?——The Roman infantry 'yielded to the 'more prevailing uſe and reputation of the ca- 'valry [3],' that is, we *believe*, were not in ſuch frequent uſe and high reputation as the cavalry.—— Pharas '*expected*, during a winter ſiege, the ope-

---

[1] p. 122. [2] p. 128. [3] p. 130.

'ration of diſtreſs on the mind of the Vandal 'king[1];' that is, he waited for it.——We have this *elegant* jeſt: 'Labat reckoned at Rome one 'hundred and thirty eight thouſand five hundred 'and ſixty-eight Chriſtian ſouls, beſides eight or 'ten thouſand Jews—*without ſouls*[2]?'—*O lepidum caput!*

There is a quick, glancing turn of reflection in the author, that very frequently throws the reader out in the purſuit, and leaves him behind. This is one of the many touches of Tacitus, in Mr. Gibbon. And it is marked, as in Tacitus, by a haſty abruptneſs of ideas, and an involving darkneſs of words.——Thus 'the martial train, which attended 'Beliſarius's footſteps' in the ſtreets of Conſtantinople, is ſaid to have '*left his perſon more acceſſible* '*than in a day of battle*[3].' What does this mean? ——Thus alſo 'Theodoſius had been educated in 'the Eunomian hereſy; the African voyage was 'conſecrated by the baptiſm and auſpicious name 'of the firſt follower who embarked; and the pro'ſelyte was adopted into the family of his ſpiritual 'parents, Beliſarius and Antonina[4]'. This is a ſentence *Thebano ænigmate digna.*

The author is alſo involved himſelf at times, in the cloud which he ſpreads over his readers.—We are told that Beliſarius, diſcovering his wife and an almoſt naked youth by themſelves in a ſubterranean chamber, '*conſented* to diſbelieve the evidence 'of his own ſenſes[5].' But this *poſitive* conſent is

[1] p. 149.
[2] p. 179.
[3] p. 202—203.
[4] p. 205.
[5] p. 205.

immediately afterwards ſtated, as a *doubtful* one. 'From this pleaſing, and *perhaps* voluntary delu-'ſion,' adds Mr. Gibbon, 'Beliſarius was awaken-'ed,' &c. And, to complete the contradiction, we afterwards return to the poſitive again, and are told that his 'credulity appears to have been 'ſingular[1].'——'In the country between the Elbe 'and the Oder,' ſays the text, 'ſeveral populous 'villages of Luſatia *are inhabited by the Vandals*; 'they *ſtill preſerve* their language, their cuſtoms, 'and the purity of their blood; ſupport, with ſome 'impatience, the Saxon or Pruſſian yoke; and 'ſerve, with ſecret and voluntary allegiance, the 'deſcendant of their ancient kings, who, in his garb 'and preſent fortune, is confounded with the meaneſt 'of his vaſſals[2].' This is a moſt extraordinary relation indeed. It is evidently of the ſame fabric, with a community of *Greeks* ſtill talking their native language in the ſouth of Italy; a race of *Cimbri*, equally talking theirs in the north of Italy; both noticed by men who *have never ſeen either*, but both unknown to their very neighbours; and, what is a proper accompaniment to both, with the inviſible army at Knightſbridge. And Mr. Gibbon here ſhews us that weakneſs of hiſtorical credulity, which often attends the moſt vigorous exertors of religious infidelity. We are gravely told by him alſo, in a note ſubjoined; that, 'from the mouth of the great 'elector (in 1687), Tollius deſcribes *the ſecret roy-'alty*, and *the rebellious ſpirit*, of the Vandals of

---

[1] p. 207.
[2] p. 155.

'Brandenburgh, who could muſter five or ſix 'thouſand men,' &c. Thus this unknown race of Vandals, with their unknown ſovereign at the head and at the tail of them, which was revealed to the eyes of Europe for the firſt time, by 'the great 'elector in the year 1687;' has ſtrangely ſunk behind the veil again, and has been ever ſince as inviſible as they were before. The mountains of India, that have ſo long concealed the pigmies in their ſecret vales, ſtretch their long arms into Luſatia, and hide a pigmy race of Vandals in their deſerts. Luſatia, indeed, might be removed half the circumference of the globe from us; by the turn and tenour of ſuch a wild diſcovery, as this. But, after all, the underſtanding of Mr. Gibbon ſeems to awake a little, from its antiquarian dream. And to the contradiction of all, that he has ſaid in the text above, and in the note before, he adds immediately afterwards; that 'the *veracity*, not of the 'Elector, but of Tollius, *may juſtly be ſuſpected*.' He thus comes at laſt to *ſuſpect* the *truth*, of what he himſelf *has aſſerted for truth*. The whole is a mere fiction, no doubt; fabricated either by Tollius himſelf, or, what is much more probable, in ſome jocular moment impoſed upon Tollius by 'the great elector[1].'

The

---

[1] *To the* EDITOR *of the* ENGLISH REVIEW.

SIR,

In your continuation of the Strictures on Mr. Gibbon's Hiſtory, I find that you attack the account this writer gives, of a ſmall tribe of Vandals who inhabit part of Luſatia, and chiefly

The FOURTH,

or forty-ſecond chapter, contains ſome intimations concerning the Lombards, ſome concerning the Bulgarians

chiefly that part which is ſubject to the Elector of Saxony. Whatever may be Mr. Gibbon's miſtakes in other reſpects, in this he is right enough. I will not anſwer for the truth, 'of 'their ſerving ſtill the deſcendant of their ancient kings;' at leaſt the circumſtance is unknown to me; and I have never heard it mentioned by any one of that little nation, of which I once knew many individuals. The people certainly exiſt, and are called in Saxony *Wenden*, i. e. Wendts, or Vandals, or Wendiſh. They are chiefly peaſants; uncouth and uncivilised, and extremely tenacious of their language, their ancient cuſtoms, and manners. Their language is equally different from the German, and from any language derived from the Latin; in ſhort, it is a branch of the Sclavonian. Many of them are entirely ignorant of the German, and conſequently debarred from all ſources of information. They have, in their own language, ſome books of devotion, and a New Teſtament; but I do not recollect, whether they have the Old Teſtament. They ſend conſtantly a certain number of young men to the univerſity of Leipſic, many of whom I have known. Theſe, when among themſelves, always ſpoke their native language; and every Saturday one of them preaches, in Wendiſh, a ſermon in the univerſity church, by way of practiſing his future deſtination.

The exiſtence of theſe Vandals is by no means unknown in this country. Some years ago I was aſked about them, by a gentleman in the neighbourhood of Eton, who is known for his reſearches into various languages. I procured him a certain number of radical verbs, ſome paſſages of the New Teſtament, and the Lord's Prayer; and he inſtantly declared (what I knew very well) the language to be a branch of the Sclavonian.

If you ſhould think it worth your while, Sir, to inſert this into your Review; I will add here part of the Lord's Prayer, which

Bulgarians and Sclavonians, ſome concerning the Turks, the Abyſſinians, &c.; and an account of a war

which is very different indeed from that of the Germans, by whom they are ſurrounded on every ſide;

'Neisch wotze kizszy ty we ne bessach ſzweczene bycz
'broje me no isschindz knam ſwoje kralen stwo: twoja wola
'ſzo sfain kesiz na nebiu tak ſeisch na ſemo.'

Pardon me, Sir, for troubling you with this letter, which, as it tends to information, I thought would not be diſagreeable to you from

Dec. 3*d*, 1788. A Reader of the Engliſh Review.

To the EDITORS *of the* ENGLISH REVIEW.

GENTLEMEN,

A correſpondent, in your laſt Review, having doubted whether the Bible has been tranſlated into that dialect of the Sclavonian, which is ſpoken in Upper Luſatia; I can inform him, that ſuch an one was printed at Budiſſen or Bautzew, in quarto, in 1728, and in a ſmaller form in 1742. This tranſlation was made from Luther's, by four clergymen, natives of that country, who appear to have executed their taſk with very great ability and zeal. Having determined on this laudable undertaking, they met at Budiſſen, and agreed what part of the work each of them ſhould reſpectively take. They entered upon it April 14, 1716, and brought it to a concluſion September 27, 1727. During this period they held forty-five meetings, each of which generally laſted three days; for the purpoſe of mutually diſcuſſing the ſenſe of difficult texts, collating their tranſlation with the Sclavonian, Poliſh, Bohemian, and other verſions, and reviſing every part with the utmoſt care and attention.

The Wenden, or, as they were anciently called, Sorabi, and more properly, in their own language, Sſerbi, became, it is probable, early converts to Chriſtianity. Biſhop Otho, who, in the reign of the emperor Lotharius II. at the beginning of the twelfth century, travelled from Bamberg into Pomerania to propagate

war between the Romans and the Perſians. But it is made up generally of ſuch petty parts, intimations
ſo

propagate the Chriſtian faith in thoſe parts; is ſaid, in paſſing through Luſatia, to have completed the converſion of the inhabitants of that country from paganiſm. It is certain, that they renounced the errors of the Church of Rome, ſoon after Luther oppoſed them with ſo much ſucceſs; and embraced the doctrines of that great reformer. Little, however, was done to furniſh them with religious inſtruction, by the publication of books in their own proper dialect, till the year 1703; when the pious munificence of a noble female, procured them a tranſlation of the Pſalms of David, and, three years after, that of the New Teſtament. The inhabitants of Lower Luſatia ſpeak a dialect, different in ſome reſpects from that abovementioned. The New Teſtament has been tranſlated into it. I forbear to add more on this ſubject. If you think the above worthy a place in your Journal, you are welcome to it from

Your conſtant reader,

Jan 19, 1789. OXONIENSIS.

To the EDITOR *of the* ENGLISH REVIEW.

SIR,

Having juſt read a letter in your poſtſcript to the laſt Review, calculated to correct a ſlight notice in your Reviewer's animadverſions upon Mr. Gibbon; I beg leave to enter my proteſt, againſt the correction.

Your Reviewer obſerved a ſtrange ſort of credulity in Mr. Gibbon, who ſaid 'ſeveral populous villages of Luſatia were 'inhabited by *Vandals*,' even now. This aſſertion however, adds your letter-writer, is true. 'Whatever may be Mr. Gibbon's miſtakes in other reſpects,' he ſays, 'in this he is right 'enough.' Let us therefore ſee how he proves his point.

Theſe VANDALS, Mr. Gibbon tells us, '*ſerve* with *ſecret* or '*voluntary* allegiance *the deſcendant of their ancient kings*, who, in 'his *garb* and *preſent fortunes*, is *confounded* with the *meaneſt* of 'his *vaſſals*.' Who then is there, that muſt not laugh with the Reviewer, ſo unintereſting, and incidents ſo indeciſive, that the hiſtory becomes dull and drawling. The rays of

---

Reviewer, at ‘ this *unknown* race of VANDALS, with their *unknown* ſovereign at the *head* and at the *tail* of them.” Even your letter-writer cannot aſſert *this* great and ſtriking circumſtance, to be true. ‘ I will not anſwer for the truth,’ he honeſtly informs us, ‘ of their ſerving the deſcendant of their ancient kings;’ and much leſs can he anſwer for their ſerving him ‘ with ſecret or voluntary allegiance,’ and of his being, ‘ in garb and preſent fortunes, confounded with the meaneſt of his vaſſals.’ He adds alſo thus: ‘ At leaſt the circumſtance is *unknown* to me; and I have *never* heard it *mentioned* by *any* one.’ The letter-writer, therefore, gives up all the ſingular and marvellous circumſtances of the ſtory at once.

Yet he *aſſerts* the *general* poſition to be true. But how does he *prove* it to be ſo? By this extraordinary mode of reaſoning. ‘ *The people* certainly exiſt,’ he avers. Yet *what* is the people? ‘ A ſmall tribe of VANDALS,’ he anſwers; ‘ who inhabit part of Luſatia, and chiefly that part which is ſubject to the Elector of Saxony.’ What then is the evidence for this tribe of VANDALS? It follows thus: ‘ They are called in Saxony WENDEN, *i. e.* Wendts, *or Vandals, or* Wendiſh.’ The author thus *aſſumes* the one only point, which he was to prove. And the VANDALICK origin is *ſhewn*, by an *arbitrary* converſion of *Wenden* into *Vandals.*

Nor is this converſion merely arbitrary. It is, alſo, hiſtorically falſe. This author has not yet learned, that there was actually a tribe of VENEDI in antient Germany. Tacitus ſpeaks of them particularly thus: ‘ Pucinorum, *Venedorumque*, et Fennorum nationes, Germanis an Sarmatis aſcribam, dubito,’ &c. (De Mor. Germ. 46). Thoſe *Wendts* therefore, if their appellation be national and antient, are apparently derived from the *Venedi*. And their very language confirms this obvious etymology. ‘ Their language,’ the letter-writer aſſures us, ‘ is—a branch of the *Sclavonian*.’ In exact conformity with this ſays Jornandes, concerning ‘ *Venidarum* natio populoſa—; quorum of hiſtorical light in the whole, are ſo many, ſo faint, and ſo ſtraggling; that they little *illuminate*

'quorum nomina, licet nunc per varias familias et loca mutentur, principaliter tamen *Sclavi* et Antès nominantur.'

But were not, it may be aſked by the pertinacity of diſputation, the *Venedi* and the *Vandals* the ſame? Certainly not, upon any principles of *hiſtorical* identity. The *Venedi* are noticed by Tacitus, as on the doubtful confines of Sarmatia and Germany. Pliny, who may be conſidered as a cotemporary with Tacitus, ſpeaks to the ſame effect: 'quidam hæc habitari ad Viſtulam uſque fluvium, a Sarmatis, *Venedis*, Scyris, Hirris, tradunt' (iv. 13). And yet Pliny himſelf ſpeaks of the *Vandals*, as totally different: 'Germanorum genera v, *Vindili*, quorum pars Burgundiones, Varini, Carini, Guttones' (iv. 14). Theſe two names, we ſee, were cotemporary. That of *Vandals* was a generick appellation, including the Guttones, the Carini, the Varini, and the Burgundiones. And that of *Venedi* was a ſpecific one, totally diſtinct from it and from all.

Your letter-writer, then, has failed egregiouſly in his attempt to aſſiſt Mr. Gibbon in this moment of diſtreſs. But, what is very remarkable, Mr. Gibbon himſelf declines his aſſiſtance. The writer was not at all aware of this. Yet it is very certain. Mr. Gibbon acknowledges expreſsly in a note at the end, as the Reviewer has obſerved, that 'the veracity—of Tollius,' the relater of the ſtory, 'may *juſtly* be *ſuſpected*.' He thus daſhes the whole anecdote at once, out of the ſyſtem of *real* hiſtory; and ranks it among the dubious and ſuſpected incidents of man, thoſe thin ſhades and ſpectres of hiſtory, that float in a kind of neutral ſtate between exiſtence and non-entity. And, by this movement of dexterity, he ſteals out at the back-door, while the letter-writer is waiting for him at the fore-door; and ſlips off from him, and from his own aſſertion, together.

Rebus omiſſis,
Atria ſervantem poſtico fallit *amicum*.

Jan. 4, 1789. I am, Sir, yours,
Temple.

Another Reader of the Engliſh Review.

the reader, and never *warm* him. Nor have we a ſingle trace of the main ſubject, the decline and fall of the empire; except in ſudden incurſions of hoſtility and in temporary ceſſions of territory. But we mark a plain conſciouſneſs in the author, that he is deviating from the preſcribed and proper line of his hiſtory in all this. He accordingly apologiſes for his conduct, in one part of it thus. 'This narrative 'of *obſcure* and *remote* events,' he ſays, 'is not *fo-'reign* to the decline and fall of the Roman empire[1].' And he aſſigns a reaſon for it, which refers to his account of the Abyſſinians: 'If a Chriſtian power 'had been maintained in Arabia,' by the Abyſſinians marching into it; 'Mahomet muſt have 'been cruſhed in his cradle, and Abyſſinia would 'have prevented a revolution, which has changed 'the civil and religious ſtate of the world.' But ſurely this reaſon is as poor in itſelf, as it is narrow in its extent. If the Chriſtians of Abyſſinia *had* marched into Arabia, *had* reduced the country, and *had* kept poſſeſſion of it; *then* they would *either* have cruſhed Mahomet, *or* been expelled by him. This is all the conſequence that would have enſued. That they *muſt* have cruſhed Mahomet, is an aſſertion equally without authority, and without probability. Mahomet would probably have aſſumed a new ſhape. And he, who propagated his religion with the ſword, would with his ſword have firſt vindicated the *freedom* of his country, and then given it his religion, with a higher authority and a quicker efficacy. The ſpirit of philoſophiſing in hiſtory, is often aſleep in thoſe who profeſs it moſt. But even if the prevented invaſion of Arabia, *had* it taken place, *would* have cruſhed Mahomet, and prevented all his operations; is this a ſufficient juſtification of Mr. Gibbon, for entering into a 'narrative of obſcure and remote events?' Are all the incidents, however 'remote' and however 'obſcure,' that would have prevented (if they had happened) the main object of any hiſtory; to be recorded in the hiſtory itſelf? Is the war of Cæſar in Gaul, for inſtance, to be deſcribed in a 'narrative of events,' by the hiſtorian of his expedition into Britain? Had Arioviſtus's invaſion of Gaul been ſucceſsful, Cæſar 'muſt have been cruſhed 'in his cradle;' and Germany 'would have prevented a revolution, which changed the civil 'and religious ſtate of our iſland world.' An hiſtorian therefore, who had undertaken to delineate the *decline* and *fall* of the *Britiſh* empire in this iſland, would upon Mr. Gibbon's principles and performance be fully juſtified; if he ſhould give a 'narrative of' thoſe 'remote' events, and even ſtep ſtill further aſide, to deſcribe the court of Arioviſtus and the country of Germany. And no one period of the Roman hiſtory could be written, without a 'narrative' of the period or periods immediately preceding; exactly as many of our old chroniclers cannot enter upon the hiſtory of their own country, without giving us all the general hiſtory of man preceding, and going previouſly from Adam down to Caſſivelaun. All indeed, that is requiſite to be done in every hiſtory, is to generaliſe the incidents that happen before the commencement of it, and have any influence, either preventive or operative, upon it. If their influence is operative, they ſhould be placed in a direct point of general view; if it is only preventive, they ſhould be very ſlightly touched, or indeed not touched at all. And, as Mr. Gibbon could not but ſee this, becauſe it is what we may juſtly call the *common ſenſe* of hiſtorical compoſition; ſo he actually ſaw it, and therefore promiſed to give us only 'the important 'circumſtances,' and (which is more) only 'the 'moſt' important, in the 'decline and fall' of the empire. He was to cut off all the circumſtances, even in the immediate hiſtory of its decline and fall that were not *peculiarly* important. He was doubly therefore, to cut off all circumſtances of 'obſcure 'and remote events,' that only affected the decline and fall of the empire diſtantly. And he was tenfold more to cut off all ſuch, as merely carried a *preventive* influence with them; as would certainly, if they had happened, have prevented a formidable enemy from riſing; or as *might probably* have done ſo, But Mr. Gibbon has neglected equally what he ſaw, what he promiſed, and what he ſhould have done. He ranges like a great comet, without line or limit. And he has ſo far formed a hiſtory, that, conſidered in its executed plan, is wild, excentric, and extravagant,

---

[1] P. 270.

In it the Goths 'affect to bluſh, that they 'muſt diſpute the kingdom of Italy with a nation 'of tragedians, pantomimes, and *pirates*[1].' Yet a note adds, that 'this laſt epithet of Procopius 'ναυτας λωπόδυτας, is too nobly tranſlated by *pi*'*rates*; *naval thieves* is the proper word.' Why was it not then uſed?——It is ſaid, that Coſrhoes 'formed a temporary bridge' over the 'Euphrates,' 'and *defined* the ſpace of three days for the entire 'paſſage of his numerous hoſt[2].'——There is often a Latin and often a French idiom, obſervable in the language of Mr. Gibbon. *This* is a Latin one; the Engliſh is, *fixed.*——And the River Phaſis 'deſcends with ſuch *oblique* vehemence, that, 'in a ſhort ſpace, it is traverſed by one hundred 'and twenty bridges[3].'

The FIFTH,

or forty-third chapter contains the hiſtory, of loſing and recovering Italy to the eaſtern empire; and an account of the comets, the earthquakes, and the plagues in the Eaſt. We are thus tranſported on the wings of this Hippogryffin hiſtory, to a ſphere that lies beyond the orb of its preſent deſign, and to one that we have ſeen torn down from its place. We have already ſeen the Vandals, tearing down the weſtern empire from its ſtation in the hiſtory. Yet we were carried, in the firſt chapter of this volume, to the ruins of it; and obliged to attend the conflict of a ſecond ſort of Vandals with the firſt, one ſtriving to maintain, and the other to acquire, the privilege of trampling upon thoſe ruins. We were then called upon to go with the Romans of Conſtantinople, and war with them for thoſe very ruins. And we are now dragged into Italy a third time, to ſee it again loſt to the barbarians, and again recovered to the eaſtern empire. We thus find the weſtern giving us and our hiſtorian, almoſt as much trouble after its death, as it did in its life-time.

---

[1] p. 213. [2] p. 246. [3] p. 250.

> ————The times have been,
> That, when the brains were out, the man would die,
> And there an end; but now they riſe again
> With twenty mortal murthers on their crowns,
> And puſh us from our ſtools: this is more ſtrange
> Than ſuch a murther is.

All this indeed, as a part of the eaſtern hiſtory, might have been told in a *full* hiſtory of the eaſtern empire. But it ought not to have been told, in a hiſtory only of its decline and fall. And it peculiarly ought not, when reaſon required and the author had promiſed, that we ſhould have only 'the 'moſt important circumſtances, of its' very 'decline and fall.' But the author is continually on the ſtrain, in exerting a minuteneſs of diligence, and in exerciſing an obſcure laborioufneſs, to ſwell the hiſtory beyond its natural ſize. He has not that happy power of genius within him, to graſp 'the 'important,' points of the hiſtory, to ſeize peculiarly 'the moſt important,' to detatch them from the rubbiſh of littleneſs and inſignificance, and to make them the conſtituent parts of his hiſtory. He ſaw that this was his duty; but he could not act up to it. He drew the outline of his work with a critical hand; but he went beyond it on every ſide, in the excurſiveneſs of his licentious pencil. And his plan only ſerves at preſent, to unite with ſound criticiſm in condemning him; to point out the *dropſical* ſpirit of writing, by which he has dilated the ſubſtance of two volumes into ſix; and to brand that accumulation of adventitious matter, with which his hiſtory is ſo heavily loaded, that it is breaking down under its own bulk.

In one page we have theſe words, 'Nicopolis, the *trophy* of 'Auguſtus [1];' becauſe he obtained a victory near it, and built it in honour of the victory. In the ſame page we have a general's '*want* of *youth* and 'experience.'——In another 'the extreme lands of 'Italy' are ſaid to have been, 'the *term* of their 'deſtructive progreſs [2].' And let us add, what this chapter forces us to feel, that the hiſtory frequently *reads like a riddle*, from the obſcurity of it.

The SIXTH

or forty-fourth chapter is an account, no leſs than *eighty-five* pages in length, of the Roman juriſprudence; traced through the regal, the conſular, and the imperial times, to the days of Juſtinian; and containing a particular detail of the proviſions made by it, for the various objects of law. The chapter is long and tireſome, from the ample nature of the ſubject, and from the neceſſary dryneſs of the diſquiſition. Yet it has much learning, much good ſenſe, and more *parade* of both. But nothing can ſubdue the native barrenneſs, of ſuch a field as this.

---

[1] p 296 [2] p. 309.

And, if any thing could, what has a diſquiſition on *all* the laws of *all* the Romans, to do with a hiſtory of the decline and fall of the empire? Even if it had the legal knowledge of Trebonius, Papinian, and Ulpian united together; if it had alſo the *philoſophy*, of all the formers of polity and remarkers upon man, that theſe modern times have produced; and if both were ſet off with the energy of a Tacitus, and the brilliancy of a Burke; we ſhould only point at the whole as a ſet of more ſplendid abſurdities, and cry out with diſdain,

> Beauties they are, but beauties out of place.

A treatiſe on the domeſtic life of the Romans; a diſſertation on the buttons, the ſtrings, and the latchets of their military dreſs; on any thing more trifling (hiſtorically conſidered,) among the many trifles of antiquarianiſm; would have been almoſt as proper for the hiſtory, as ſuch a diſquiſition upon their laws. That Juſtinian ſhould have the honour attributed to him, of compiling the code, the inſtitutes, and the pandects; is very reaſonable. But it is very unreaſonable, that a long and laboured diſſertation on the laws of all the periods of the Roman hiſtory, with an enumeration of its particular proviſions, ſhould be given as a part of the hiſtory; and the eſſence of the ſtatute-book ſerved up, as an hiſtorical diſh. In the fulleſt hiſtory of the empire, ſuch literary cookery as this would be very abſurd. It is ſtill more abſurd, in a hiſtory only of the decline and fall of the empire. And it is moſt of all abſurd, when we had been ſo expreſsly aſſured,

that

that we ſhould have only 'the circumſtances of its 'decline and fall.'

We are told to '*appreciate* the labours' of Juſtinian[1]. The author is fond of the word in this harſh application of it; we have ſeen him uſing it before; and we ſhall ſee him again. After noticing Cato the cenſor and his ſon, as men ſkilled in the law; he remarks, that 'the kindred appellation of 'Mutius Scævola was illuſtrated by three ſages of 'the law[2].' How obſcure! He means, that this family had the honour of producing three good lawyers.—In the ſame page he mentions 'a *century* 'of volumes.'—In a farther we have, 'the *expoſition* 'of children[3],' for the *expoſing* of them; 'the tame 'animals, whoſe nature is tractable to the arts of '*education*[4];' 'the agreement of ſale, for a certain 'price, *imputes*,' inſtead of *reckons*, 'from that moment the chances of gain or loſs to the account 'of the purchaſer[5];' 'the pain or the diſgrace of a 'word or blow cannot eaſily be *appreciated* by a pe'cuniary equivalent[6];' 'the extirpation of a *more* 'valuable tree[7],' where the comparative is uſed for the poſitive degree, very abſurdly in a liſt of legal puniſhments; and 'a prudent legiſlator *appreciates* 'the guilt and puniſhment[8].'

We have noticed before the propenſity of Mr. Gibbon to obſcenity. It was then, however, covered moſtly under a veil of Greek. But, in p. 375, his obſcenity throws off every cover, and comes ſtalking forth in the impudence of nakedneſs. A ſoul, deeply tinctured with ſenſuality, loves to brood over ſenſual ideas itſelf, to preſent ſenſual objects to others, and ſo to enjoy its own ſenſuality of ſpirit over again.

---

[1] p. 333. [2] p. 350. [3] p. 373. [4] p. 384. [5] p. 396.
[6] p. 398. [7] p. 401. [8] p. 406.

But, in p. 414, he is ſtill more vicious. He then mounts up into an avowed advocate—for what? for no leſs an enormity than MURDER; and even for that which, of all murders, is the only one that precludes repentance, precludes pardon, and ends the life with the crime of the murderer. ‘The civilians,’ ſays this champion for ſelf-murder, ‘have ‘always reſpected *the natural right* of a citizen *to* ‘*diſpoſe of his life*;——but the precepts of the ‘*goſpel*, or the *church*, have at length *impoſed* a pious ‘*ſervitude* on the minds of Chriſtians, and *condemn* ‘them to expect, *without a murmur*, the *laſt* ſtroke ‘of diſeaſe or the executioner.’ So boldly is Mr. Gibbon here treading, in the ſteps of his honoured acquaintance the late Mr. Hume! With all Mr. Hume's ſpirit too, he arraigns the ‘precepts of the ‘goſpel;’ if they be (he hints) the precepts of the goſpel, and not the mere injunctions ‘of the church;’ for prohibiting ſelf-murder. With a ſimilar ſpirit, in the text of p. 380, he ſpeaks of ‘the wiſhes of ‘the church;’ when his note makes them to be, the *laws of Chriſt* and the *precepts of St. Paul.* And as it is highly to the honour of our religion, that theſe patrons of ſelf-murder are compelled to ſet aſide the dictates of the goſpel, and the admonitions of the church, before they can vindicate their profligate ſpeculations; ſo does Mr. Gibbon's ſpeculation here, ſeem to tell us with a melancholy energy; to what a dreadful relief he may perhaps have recourſe hereafter. May repentance anticipate diſtreſs; and the light of Chriſtianity break in upon his mind, to ſtop the uplifted arm of ſuicide!

The SEVENTH

or forty-fifth chapter, relates principally to the invaſion of Italy by the Lombards, and the ſeparation of it again from the eaſtern empire. This is therefore, in all its principal parts, a mere digreſſion. We have ſhewn this ſufficiently before; nor need we to ſay more upon the ſubject. We have only to obſerve, that there is one link more added to the chain of abſurdity; that to the digreſſional account of the Goths and Vandals, of the Goths and the eaſtern emperors, is now ſubjoined a long hiſtory of the Lombards, the emperors, and the Goths; that all theſe continued events of the Italian hiſtory, cannot have the leaſt relation to the *weſtern* empire, becauſe *this* has long ſince vaniſhed from the earth; and that they equally cannot form *any* circumſtances of the decline and fall of the *eaſtern,* becauſe Italy was the ſeat of the *weſtern.* In every light, the narrative of events in Italy, after Italy has been ſo formally ſwept away from the ſtage of the hiſtory, is all impertinence.

A faint and tremulous kind of light, too, is all that is thrown over the narrative. This ſometimes breaks out and engages the attention. But it is generally too tremulous to caſt a ſteady illumination, and too faint to furniſh a ſtrong one.

And it ſerves only, like the natural twilight, to preſent the ſhadows of objects to our view. The whole ſcene of hiſtory before us, therefore, is dark, broken, and uninviting.

But digreſſion is the great feeder of Mr. Gibbon's hiſtory. 'I ſhould not be apprehenſive,' he ſays, 'of deviating from my ſubject, if it was in my 'power to delineate the private life of the con-'querors of Italy,' the Lombards[1]. Italy, having been once a grand object of his hiſtory, is for ever to remain ſo, it ſeems. It is not merely to remain, as long only as it is connected with the eaſtern empire. This the firſt chapter of this volume proves deciſively. The tranſactions of the Goths in it have no relation to the eaſtern at all, and have a relation only to the Vandal ſettlers of Italy. Italy, therefore, is the connecting line of the hiſtory. And, upon the ſame principle, he may purſue the hiſtory to the coming of the Normans into the ſouth of Italy; and then give us an account, of *their* domeſtic life, *their* civil laws, and *their* military tranſactions.

We have the court of Juſtinian arranged, on the formal reception of ſome ambaſſadors, 'according 'to the military and civil order of'—what? of 'the *hierarchy*[2].' This is extraordinary. Were then the perſons who held 'civil and military' offices about the court, arranged in ſome order, ſimilar to that of archbiſhops, biſhops, &c. in the church? No! They were arranged in the military and civil order of the hierarchy itſelf. And the word hierarchy is only uſed, with a ridiculous miſapplication of it, for the very court.

---

[1] p. 149. [2] p. 149.

The EIGHTH,

or forty-ſixth chapter relates principally, the ſucceſſes of the Romans under Tiberius, and the extenſion of the eaſtern bounds of their empire, 'beyond the example of former times, as far as the 'banks of the Araxes and the neighbourhood of 'the Caſpian ſea[1];' and the great victories of Heraclius over Perſia, when 'the return of Heraclius 'from Taurus to Conſtantinople was a perpetual 'triumph[2].' Theſe glorious events, undoubtedly, make a proper part of the hiſtory of the eaſtern empire. But they do not of the preſent hiſtory. This, we muſt ever remember, is a hiſtory only of its *decline and fall.* And when the author planned his work, we muſt equally recollect, he was to give us only 'the circumſtances of its decline and fall,' 'only the important' too among them, and only, 'the moſt important.'

The Caſpian ſea, we are told, 'was explored, '*for the firſt time*, by an hoſtile fleet' under Pom'pey. But 'in the hiſtory of the world,' adds Mr. Gibbon in a note, 'I can only perceive two 'navies on the Caſpian, 1. of the Macedonians— '2. of the Ruſſians[3].' The very fleet of the text, is moſt unaccountably ſhut out of the Caſpian by the note.——We are alſo told, ‘ the *city* and *palace* ‘ of Modain had already *eſcaped* from the *hand* of ‘ the tyrant[1].’——We find, that ‘ the ruin of the ‘ proudeſt monument of Chriſtianity, was vehe- ‘ mently urged by the intolerant ſpirit of the ‘ Magi[2].’ But what is this ‘ proudeſt monument ‘ of Chriſtianity?’ Is it that nobleſt edifice of Chriſtian, or even of Pagan, architecture, the church of St. Peter at Rome? No! The words mean, as the context ſhews, either Jeruſalem or ſome building within it. ‘ The conqueſt of Jeruſalem—was ‘ atchieved by the zeal and avarice of’ Chroſroes; ‘ the ruin,’ &c. And, on again examining the context critically, we ſee it means the church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jeruſalem. So obſcure is this writer at times! He ſays afterwards, that ‘ Jeruſa- ‘ lem itſelf was taken by aſſault,’ and that ‘ the ſe- ‘ pulchre of Chriſt, and the ſtately churches of He- ‘ lena and Conſtantine, were conſumed, or at leaſt ‘ damaged, by the flames.’ The ſtately churches of Helena and Conſtantine are only *one*, that over the Holy Sepulchre. And is this then, in Mr. Gibbon's opinion, ‘ the proudeſt monument of Chriſ- ‘ tianity;’ when he knows St. Peter's to be exiſting at Rome? Or could this be ‘ the proudeſt monu- ‘ ment of Chriſtianity,’ in the opinions of the Magi; when they knew St. Sophia's to be exiſting at Conſtantinople?—Some cavalry are ſaid ‘ to hang on the *laſſitude* and *diſorder* of Heraclius's rear[3].’ The expreſſion is artificial and affected. The natural language is, *to hang upon his haraſſed and diſorderly rear.* But nature was turned out to make way for art.——Mr. Gibbon, with the ſame ſpirit of affectation, '*educates* the new recruits in the knowledge 'and practice of military *virtue*[1].'——We ſee the ſame ſpirit at work, though leſs offenſively, in making Heraclius 'by a juſt gradation of magni-'ficent ſcenes,' that is, in the language of propriety and eaſe, *through ſcenes gradually riſing in magnificence*, 'to penetrate to the royal ſeat of Daſtagerd[2].'——And in p. 530 we have another oppoſition, between the text and the notes. The text records 'the 'loſs of two hundred thouſand ſoldiers, who had 'fallen by the ſword' in the wars of Heraclius againſt Perſia. But a note adds this obſervation: 'Suidas—gives this number; but *either* the *Perſian* 'muſt be read *for* the *Iſaurian* war, *or* this paſſage '*does not belong* to the emperor Heraclius.' He thus applies a paſſage to the hiſtory, without any heſitation; when he is obliged at the very moment, either to *alter* or to *reject* it; and when he even *owns*, that he is.

---

[1] p. 480. [2] p. 529. [3] p. 468.

---

[1] p. 473.

[2] p. 502.

[3] p. 511.

'The general independence of the Arabs,' he ſays, in a note, 'which cannot be admitted with-'out many limitations, is blindly aſſerted in a ſepa-'rate diſſertation of the authors of the Univerſal 'Hiſtory, Vol. XX. p. 196—250. A perpetual 'miracle is ſuppoſed to have guarded the prophecy, 'in favour of the poſterity of Iſhmael; and theſe 'learned bigots are not afraid, to riſk the truth

---

[1] p. 512.

[2] p. 524.

‘ of Chriſtianity on this frail and ſlippery founda‘ tion[1].’ With ſuch a tone of inſolence, can Mr. Gibbon abuſe a champion of Chriſtianity! Like Virgil, he throws about his *dung* with an air of majeſty. He did ſo to Mr. Davis, in the very moments in which he was complaining of Mr. Davis's rudeneſs. Mr. Davis indeed had provoked him, with the rudeneſs of refutation and detection. And the preſent author has alſo provoked him, by producing an hiſtorical argument in favour of Judaiſm and Chriſtianity, which he could not refute and yet would not believe. He therefore took the natural courſe, of ridiculing what he could not anſwer, and of abuſing what chagrined and gravelled him. But he had been much wiſer to have ſaid nothing, to have never noticed the diſſertation, and ſo to have concealed his own impotence of malice againſt it. It was written by the late Mr. Swinton of Oxford, and proves the continued independency of the ſons of Iſhmael, by ſuch a long train of hiſtorical evidences; as is very wonderful in itſelf, as unites moſt powerfully to ſupport the point aſſerted, and as terminates in an argument of force and weight for the *divinity* of our religion. But the author is ‘ a learned bigot,’ and ‘ a blind aſſertor,’ with Mr. Gibbon. And yet what is very wonderful, Mr. Gibbon himſelf allows the continued independency of the Arabs, takes this ‘ blind aſſertor’ for his oracle, and unites with this ‘ learned bigot’ in his belief. This is perhaps almoſt as wonderful, as the independency itſelf. 'The general independence of the 'Arabs,' he owns, 'CAN—be ADMITTED with—'many limitations.' Mr. Swinton has accordingly ſpecified from time to time, the 'many limitations' with which the independence is to be aſſerted; in ſhewing *all* the Arabs not to have been reduced, when moſt were; in ſhewing the *Bedoweens* (who are peculiarly the ſons of Iſhmael) not to have been, when the reſt were; and in ſhewing even *theſe*, when obliged for a moment to ſubmit, never to have been thoroughly ſubdued like the nations around them, and never, like them, incorporated into the ſubſtance of the Aſſyrian, the Perſian, the Macedonian, the Roman, or even the Turkiſh empires. Mr. Swinton thus ſtates the limitations; and Mr. Gibbon thus acknowledges the aſſertion. He acknowledges it, in the very moments in which he reprobates it. He 'admits' the point with the requiſite 'limitations.' In all this long chain of hiſtorical arguments too, which ſtretches out to the amazing length of nearly four thouſand years, which is therefore aſſailable (if weak) in ſo many different points, and in which the weakneſs of a ſingle link would have deſtroyed the whole; Mr. Gibbon, with all the obvious deſire to ſhew, and with all the apparent capacity to diſcern, does not point out *one ſingle link of weakneſs* in the whole. And, what is more, in the *text* he *aſſerts* the doctrine, which he *admits* in the *note*; aſſerts it without heſitation; and aſſerts it, even without ſtating Mr. Swinton's or his own limitations. 'The ſovereign of Perſia 'and India,' he ſays, 'aſpired to reduce under his

---

[1] P. 465.

'obedience the province of Yemen or Arabia Fe'lix, the diſtant land of myrrh and frankincenſe; 'WHICH HAD ESCAPED, rather than oppoſed, THE 'CONQUERORS OF THE EAST.' He thus acknowledges the *fact* in the plaineſt manner. The Arabs of Yemen in every age to *this* period, he owns, 'had eſcaped' all ſubjection to the various and ſucceſſive 'conquerors of the Eaſt.' So confuſed in his ideas does Mr. Gibbon here appear, as to aſſert in his text what he denies in his note, even there to admit in reality what he rejects in appearance, and to adopt the whole *hiſtory* of Mr. Swinton even while he abuſes him for it. So groſsly diſingenuous alſo does he appear, in attempting to diſcredit an hiſtorical evidence for Chriſtianity, which he could not refute; ſo wildly indiſcreet, as to attack when he could not hurt it; and ſo daringly bold, as to treat with inſolence and abuſe the very man, to whom he is obliged to ſubmit even while he is ſpurning at him. And we have entered the farther into the point, becauſe the conduct of Mr. Gibbon in it, ſerves ſtrongly to ſhew the impregnable nature of Mr. Swinton's argument; to add one ray more, to the glory of this honeſt champion for Chriſtianity; and to ſecure the ſtrong ground which he wiſely took, in this incidental defence of our religion.

The NINTH

or laſt chapter of this volume, the forty-ſeventh in the ſeries, is one of the wildeſt and moſt extravagant digreſſions, that even Mr. Gibbon has yet made. It is a diſſertation of no leſs than *eighty-nine* pages, upon what? upon *the diſputes among the Chriſtians concerning the nature of Chriſt*, and *the opinions of the eaſtern churches on the point from the beginning*. Could we think it poſſible, if the fact was not apparent before our eyes; that a man of judgment, that a writer even of common ſenſe, could ever have introduced ſuch a diſſertation into ſuch an hiſtory? Any diſſertation of a *length like this*, would have been abſurd in any hiſtory whatever. But ſuch a long diſſertation upon a point of *theology*, muſt be *very* abſurd. And ſuch a long and theological diſſertation, in a hiſtory only of the ' decline ' and fall' of the empire, and when we were to have only ' the circumſtances of its decline and ' fall,' only the ' important' too, and only ' the ' moſt important;' is infinitely abſurd. It would be a wildneſs worthy only of a Whiſton and a Prieſtley, in *any* hiſtory; but it is a madneſs calculated merely for the meridian of deiſm, in the *preſent*.

The whole alſo is very dull. It is enlivened only, and dreadfully enlivened, by the wickedneſs of it. And nothing keeps the hiſtorical mind, from ſlumbering over the pages of it; but the bold ſallies of blaſphemy in it.

' The ſeeds of the faith, which had ſlowly ariſen ' in the rocky and ungrateful ſoil of Judea, were ' tranſplanted, in full maturity, to the happier climes ' of the Gentiles; and the ſtrangers of Rome or ' Aſia, who never beheld the manhood, were the ' more readily diſpoſed to embrace [he ſhould have 'ſaid, *to believe in*] the divinity, of Chriſt[1].' We have ſelected this paſſage, as a full ſpecimen of the confuſion, which hangs upon Mr. Gibbon's underſtanding, and defeats all his theological efforts. The doctrine of our Saviour's divinity is here acknowledged, to have been preached originally to the Jews, by our Saviour and his apoſtles. This doctrine, we ſee, 'had ſlowly ariſen—in the ſoil of 'Judea.' It had even arrived at laſt, to a 'full 'maturity' there. And it had ſo done, *before* the preaching of the goſpel to the Gentiles. It was '*tranſplanted* in full maturity to the—climes of the 'Gentiles.' This therefore overthows all that he has ſaid before, of the Jews not knowing and not believing in the divinity of our Saviour. So peculiarly unfortunate is he, in annihilating his allegations by his aſſertions! But he is ſtill more ſo. This paſſage ſtands as a middle point, betwixt the future and the paſt. It looks forward to the Gentiles, as well as backward to the Jews. And it acknowledges the doctrine of our Saviour's divinity, to have been 'tranſplanted in full maturity' from 'the ſoil of Judea', into 'the happier climes 'of the Gentiles.' It acknowledges the doctrine to have been received there, even with more readineſs than in Judea. The 'ſoil of Judea' had proved 'rocky and ungrateful' to it. It had therefore riſen 'ſlowly,' though it reached a 'full maturity,' at laſt. But 'happier' were 'the climes of the 'Gentiles.' 'And the ſtrangers of Rome and A-

---

[1] P. 537.

'ſia—were—more readily diſpoſed to embrace the 'divinity of Chriſt.' So plainly does Mr. Gibbon here aſſert the divinity of our Saviour, to have been preached to the Jews, to have been preached to the Gentiles, and to have been believed in by both; from the very beginning of Chriſtianity! He thus daſhes aſide, all that he afterwards *inſinuates* rather than *avers*, againſt the Gentile reception of the doctrine. And he ſtands forward in this memorable paſſage, a Deiſt refuting the Arians, a reaſoner wounded with the two-edged ſword of his own poſitions, and a ſingular monument of literary ſuicide.

In p. 569 we have another evidence, of Mr. Gibbon's love of obſcenity. I will not repeat the offence, by producing the paſſage. Modeſty muſt for ever reprobate this ſtrange tendency of his pen. And I cannot paſs theſe groſs eruptions of ſenſuality from it, without a proper cenſure.

'The ſynod of Chalcedon,' we are told, 'would 'perhaps have reſtored Neſtorius to the honours, 'or at leaſt to the communion, of the church; the '*death* of Neſtorius *prevented* his *obedience to the* '*ſummons*[a].' This we take from the text. But let us look at the notes. 'The invitation of Neſ'torius to the ſynod of Chalcedon,' it ſays, 'is re'lated by Zacharias—and the famous Xenaias,— 'denied by Evagrius and Aſſeman, and ſtoutly 'maintained by La Croze—: *the fact is not impro'bable*; yet it was the *intereſt* of the Monophyſites,' as friends to Neſtorius, 'to *ſpread the invidious re-*

---

[a] P. 562—3.

'*port*; and Eutychius—affirms, that *Neſtorius died* 'after an exile of *ſeven* years, and conſequently *ten* 'years *before* the council of Chalcedon.' In what a ſtate of conflict are the note and text here! *This* affirms without doubt and heſitation, that Neſtorius was *ſummoned* to the council, and that 'death pre'vented his obedience to the ſummons,' and that, if death had not thus interpoſed, 'the ſynod—*would* 'perhaps *have reſtored* him to the *honours*, or *at leaſt* 'to the *communion*, of the church.' But *that* tells us another ſtory, though with great uncertainty and confuſedneſs. What is ſo poſitively aſſerted in the text, we find diſputed in the note, maintained by ſome and denied by others. Mr. Gibbon, however, interpoſes to arbitrate between the diſputants; and by his arbitration inflames the diſpute.

> Chaos umpire ſits,
> And by deciſion more embroils the fray.

'The fact,' he ſays, 'is not improbable;' when he has already aſſerted it to be more than probable, even actually true. But, at the very next ſtep, he recedes even from this faint aſſertion of its probability. For 'it was the intereſt of the Monophyſites,' he adds, 'to ſpread the invidious report.' He *therefore* doubts even the *probability*, of what he himſelf has aſſerted *poſitively*. And he inſtantly goes on to ſhow the very *falſehood*, and even the very *impoſſibility*, of the fact aſſerted by himſelf. He produces the ſweeping teſtimony of Eutychius, that Neſtorius *died* no leſs than *ten* years *before* the council ſat. And in this ſtate of the evidence he *leaves the point*, oppoſing his own intimated probability in the note, and giving the lie direct to his own aſſerted reality in the text. We have ſeen already ſuch contradictions in the notes to the text, that we have been tempted to aſk, Whether the text and notes *could* be written by the ſame hand? But the preſent paſſage ſufficiently aſſures us, that they could. The note is not more in oppoſition to the text, than it is to itſelf. And the oppoſition in all, ariſes from the turn of Mr Gibbon's mind; brilliant, excurſive, and ſtrong, but not clear, diſcriminative, and preciſe; having the wing of the eagle to ſupport its long flight, but not poſſeſſing the eye of the eagle for its keen reſearches, only poſſeſſing indeed the eye of a common bird, and ſo led the more illuſtriouſly aſtray by its eagle's wing.

CHAPTER THE THIRD.

I HAVE already expoſed the prepoſterous arrangement, which Mr. Gibbon has made of his materials in the preceding volumes of his hiſtory. I now come to his FIFTH volume. Here he ſpeaks of his previous arrangement. 'I have now deduced,' he ſays, 'from Trajan to Conſtantine, from Conſtantine 'to Heraclius, the regular ſeries of the Roman em'perors; and faithfully expoſed the proſperous and 'adverſe fortunes of their reigns[1].' Such has been the *execution* of the work, according to Mr. Gibbon himſelf! And yet, according to himſelf, the *plan* was very different. 'It is the deſign of *this* and *the two* '*ſucceeding* chapters,' he told us in the firſt page of his firſt volume, 'to deſcribe the *proſperous* condi'tion of the empire; and *afterwards*, from the 'death of Marcus Antoninus, to deduce the moſt 'important circumſtances of its *decline* and *fall*.' So very oppoſite is the plan and the execution, according to Mr. Gibbon's *own* account! He who, after the death of *Marcus Antoninus*, was to give us only 'the circumſtances,' and 'the moſt important' too, 'of the *decline* and *fall*' of the empire; here *confeſſes* he has given us 'the *regular* ſeries of the Ro'man emperors,' from 'Trajan to Conſtantine, 'from Conſtantine to Heraclius;' and has 'expoſ'ed the *proſperous*,' as well as 'adverſe, fortunes of '*their* reigns.' Mr. Gibbon thus ſtands convicted upon his own confeſſion, of a wild and devious aberration from his own plan. And all that we have urged upon this point, againſt his four volumes preceding; is here juſtified by himſelf, at the commencement of his fifth.

---

[1] P. 1.

But he is now determined to reform his execution. 'Should I perſevere in the *ſame* courſe,' he adds, 'ſhould I obſerve the *ſame* meaſure, a *prolix* 'and *ſlender* thread would be *ſpun* through *many a* '*volume*; nor would the patient reader find an a'dequate reward of inſtruction or amuſement[1].' This is again an acknowledgment of his treſpaſſes.

---

[1] Page 1—2.

Mr. Gibbon, kneeling at the chair of confeſſion, is very ingenuous. He owns the 'prolix and ſlender thread' of hiſtory, which he has 'ſpun' already through four volumes. Yet, as his ſpiritual father or his critical, I can only conſider his ingenuouſneſs to fix his ſin more fully upon him. And I proceed to conſider his reformation.

The mode of execution, which he means now to adopt, is this. 'It is in the *origin* and *conqueſts*;' he remarks, 'in the *religion* and *government*,' of the 'new colonies and riſing kingdoms,' which immediately filled the loſt provinces of the empire; 'that we muſt explore the cauſes and effects, of the decline and fall of the eaſtern empire[1].' This is certainly no *new* mode of execution. It is the very ſame, that he has purſued before with regard to the weſtern. 'In the origin and conqueſts, in the religion and government,' of the Franks, the Vandals, the Goths, and the Lombards, &c.; has he 'explored the cauſes and effects,' of *its* decline and fall. We are *therefore* to '*perſevere* in the ſame courſe,' and to '*obſerve* the ſame meaſure,' of writing. And Mr. Gibbon is confounding himſelf and his reader, by an inattention to his own conduct. 'Nor,' he adds, 'will this ſcope of narrative, the riches and variety of theſe materials, *be incompatible* with the *unity* of *deſign* and compoſition.' They will not be *more* incompatible than they have been, if only *ſo* purſued. But they will be greatly incompatible, as we have already ſeen they have been. And this intimation from Mr. Gibbon, ſhews us at once his ſuſpicion that they have been, and prepares us to expect that they will be more. 'As, in his daily prayers, the muſulman 'of Fez or Delhi ſtill turns his face towards the 'temple of Mecca,' an alluſion ſo replete with levity, that we cannot think it ſeriouſly applied; 'the hiſtorian's eye ſhall be always fixed on the 'city of Conſtantinople.' Nor is *this* a *new* mode of execution. Mr. Gibbon has always profeſſed ſurely, to keep his eye upon the central point of his whole hiſtory; and, however large he may draw the circumference, ſtill to make it move round its centre. But he has profeſſed, and not performed. His hiſtory has moved in no regular orbit. And we ſhall ſoon find it moving ſo again. 'The ex'curſive line may embrace the wilds of Arabia and 'Tartary, but the circle will be ultimately reduced 'to the decreaſing limit of the Roman monarchy.' Here the *new* mode opens faintly upon the mind. We can hardly diſcern the meaning through the metaphor. The one is incongruous, and the other is obſcure. But we diſcern enough to ſee, that Mr. Gibbon is preparing us for wilder excurſions than ever. And he accordingly puſhes his digreſſional extravagances, in the two next volumes; to a length even beyond that of all the preceding. Such is his *reformation!*

---

[1] P. 4.

or forty-eighth.——Mr. Gibbon here gives us, in a courſe of *eighty-ſeven* pages, 'a period of ſix 'hundred years,' and the reigns of 'ſixty em'perors[1];' deſcribed in ſuch a manner, that, as he himſelf allows, 'our reaſon—diſdains the ſixty *phan'toms* of kings, who have paſſed before our eyes, 'and *faintly dwell on our remembrance*[2].' The whole indeed is cold, dull, and unintereſting, becauſe it is vague, general, and incomplete. It preſents a quick ſucceſſion of incidents and characters, too quick to enforce our attention or compel our regard. We are preſented with the various faces of a diamond, each of which caſts a little luſtre, but all do not unite in one general effulgence. And we ſoon turn away, tired with the tedious and unimpreſſive variation of faintneſs.

The whole chapter, alſo, is equally *without notes* and *without references.* Mr. Gibbon *profeſſes* to give only 'a rapid abſtract, which may be ſupport'ed by a *general* appeal to the order and text of the 'original hiſtorians[3].' We therefore go on, entirely at the mercy of our conductor. He is equally left to the mercy of his own diſcretion. And we know his conduct too well already, even when he was harneſſed in the trammels of reference and authentication; to truſt this hiſtorical Pegaſus, without either bit or bridle.

---

[1] p. 85. [2] p. 86. [3] p. 4.

But there is a much greater fault behind. ‘ In ‘ this introduction,’ ſays Mr. Gibbon, concerning the preſent chapter, ‘ I ſhall *confine* myſelf to *the re-* ‘ *volutions of the throne,*’ the *ſucceſſion of families,* the ‘ *perſonal characters* of the Greek princes,’ the *mode* ‘ *of their life and death,* the *maxims and influence of* ‘ *their domeſtic government;*’ and the *tendency of their* ‘ *reign to accelerate or ſuſpend the downfal of the eaſt-* ‘ *ern empire*[1].’ This is a very ingenious way of *confining* himſelf. He will *confine* himſelf to *ſix* points, when he ought to confine himſelf to *one* of them. The *laſt* is the only point, that carries any relation to the *decline* and *fall* of the empire. He therefore promiſed formally at the beginning, to confine himſelf to the ‘ circumſtances,’ and ‘ the moſt important’ circumſtances ‘ of its decline and fall.’ And the plain good-ſenſe of criticiſm, the eternal laws of compoſition, require that he ſhould adhere to his promiſe. Yet ſo much has the habit of rambling gained the aſcendant, over the ſuggeſtions of reaſon, the convictions of his mind, and the promiſes of his pen; that he profeſſes *now* to dwell *only* upon ſix points, of which five are all extraneous to the purpoſe. He will not fly to the fixed ſtars. He will go *only* to the moon. And yet, all the while, his buſineſs is wholly upon earth.

‘ Such a chronological *review,*’ as the preſent chapter gives of the imperial hiſtory, ‘ will ſerve to ‘ illuſtrate the various argument of the ſubſequent

---

[1] P. 5.

‘ chapters; and each circumſtance of the eventful ‘ hiſtory of the barbarians, will adapt itſelf in a pro‘ per place to the Byzantine annals[1]. We are thus to have the hiſtory of the empire detached and entire by itſelf, and then the hiſtory of its invaders equally entire and detached. This is ſurely a moſt ſtrange and abſurd diſpoſition, of the parts of his hiſtory. It is ſuch as was never projected and never executed, we believe, by any *ſound* underſtanding before. The ſubſequent chapters *may* be ‘ illuſtrated,’ by the preſent; but the narration in them would have been infinitely more illuſtrated, by the *natural* union of this with that. The circumſtances in the hiſtory of the barbarians, *may* adapt themſelves to their proper places in the annals of Byzantium; but they would have been infinitely better adapted, by an *actual* aſſignment of them at the moment. Mr. Gibbon has robbed the domeſtic and foreign hiſtory, of all their reciprocal connexion; and ſo has deprived each of all the *ſeen* and *apparent* illumination, that each caſts upon the other. He has thrown the hiſtory of all the events, into great and independent maſſes of narration. He has ranged them in a number of parallel lines, that never meet. And the grand ſun of hiſtorical information, he has cut and carved into a multitude of twinkling ſtars. Nor is this conduct leſs injurious to the unity of Mr. Gibbon's hiſtory, than it is contrary to the principles of ſenſe. Thoſe parts of the domeſtic hiſtory, which ſhould connect the foreign with it, and ſo unite to form one long and regular chain of hiſtory; are all formed into a little chain by themſelves; and leave the reſt to be equally formed into little chains, all unconnected with each other. And inſtead of that golden chain, which ſhould be linked to the head of the firſt chapter, ſpread thro' all the chapters ſubſequent, and form one univerſe of harmonious hiſtory; we are preſented with a few links in one chapter, a few in another, all detached from all, and forming only the fragments of a diſordered and broken ſyſtem. Yet all this was neceſſary, to the proſecution of Mr. Gibbon's purpoſes. He found the regular and orderly ſphere of hiſtory, too narrow for his excurſions. He therefore frames a new one! It is indeed a diſgrace to his own judgment, and an affront upon his reader's underſtanding. Yet he riſks the affront and he incurs the diſgrace, rather than not indulge himſelf ſtill farther in his flights. And we muſt prepare our minds for extravagances of digreſſion, beyond all the extravagances that we have ſeen before. From the ſtrong and violent beating of its wings, we ſee the eagle is anticipating a higher and a wider range, than it has taken yet.

---

[1] P. 5.

There are many inſtances of *harſhneſs*, in the language of this chapter. 'I have now *deduced*— 'the—*ſeries* of the Roman *emperors*[1],' 'the pompous *ceremonies*, which formed the *eſſence* of the 'Byzantine ſtate[2];' 'Martina reaped the *harveſt* of 'his *death*[3];' 'their *ſilence reſpects* the wiſdom of his

---

[1] p. 1. [2] p. 8. [3] p. 9.

'adminiſtration and the purity of his manners[1],' where the double ſenſe of the word *reſpects* confounds the reader, and where the language ſhould have been, *their ſilence of reprehenſion ſhews, a reſpect for*, &c.; 'when *he* was *extinguiſhed* by a timely 'death[2];' finally vaniſhed *in*,' read *at* 'the preſence of a ſoldier[3];' 'naval armies' for a fleet[4]; 'the *ceremony* of his funeral was mourned,' read *was attended*, 'with the unfeigned tears of his ſubjects[5];' and 'a promiſe—was *ſtolen* by a dexterous emiſſary from the—patriarch[6],' read, *drawn artfully*, as the context ſhews the author means.

There are ſeveral inſtances of *obſcurity*. 'The 'chances of ſuperior merit in a great and populous 'kingdom, as they are proved by experience, 'would excuſe the imputation of imaginary millions[7];' 'the tyrant, a law of eternal juſtice, was 'degraded by the vices of his ſubjects[8];' '*public* '*method*,' of what? 'ſecured the intereſt of the 'prince and the property of the people[9];' 'Conſtantine died before his father, whoſe grief and 'credulity were amuſed by a flattering impoſtor 'and a vain apparition[10],' an inſtance of Mr. Gibbon's rapid way of writing hiſtory *at times*, as no more is ſaid, and as this only ſerves to

Fling half an image on the ſtraining eye;

'ſome evaſion and perjury were required to ſilence

---

[1] P. 21. [2] p. 45. [3] ibid. [4] ibid. [5] p. 47.
[6] p. 60. [7] p. 3. [8] ibid. [9] p. 42. [10] p. 43.

'the ſcruples of the clergy and people[1], another inſtance of the ſame; 'the firſt in the front of 'battle was thrown from his horſe by the ſtroke of 'poiſon or an arrow[2],' another inſtance; and 'a 'promiſe, which would have betrayed her falſehood 'and levity, was ſtolen by a dexterous emiſſary 'from the ambition of the patriarch; Xiphilin at 'firſt alleged the ſanctity of oaths and the ſacred 'nature of a truſt, but,' &c[3].

There are even ſome *contradictions*. Leo the emperor beholds Michael his ſucceſſor, 'releaſed 'from his chain[4];' and yet Michael has 'the fetters remaining on his legs, ſeveral hours after he 'was ſeated on the throne of the Cæſars[5].'—— 'Theophano,—after a reign of four years,— '*mingled* for her huſband the ſame deadly draught, 'which ſhe had compoſed for his father[6].' Yet all that we have heard of this before, was merely in theſe words: 'the death of Conſtantine was imputed to poiſon[7].' He was then *ſuppoſed* to be poiſoned; it is now *certain* that he was, and *by whom*; even by Theophano. And '*his ſon Romanus*,' as Mr. Gibbon told us *before*, was the perſon '*ſuſpected* of anticipating his inheritance[8].' *Then* Romanus is *ſuſpected* of poiſoning his father; *now* his wife Theophano is *aſſerted* to have poiſoned him. ——'The promiſe—was *ſtolen* by a dexterous emiſſary from the ambition of the patriarch; Xiphilin

---

[1] p. 50. [2] p. 53. [3] p. 60. [4] p. 30.
[5] p. 31. [6] p. 48. [7] p. ibid. [8] ibid.

'at firſt alleged,' &c.; 'but a whiſper—relaxed 'his ſcruples, and he—*reſigned the important paper*[1].' How could he *reſign*, what had been previouſly *ſtolen* from him?

There are alſo ſome *abſurdities*, 'By the im'poſition of *holy orders*, the grandſon of Heraclius 'was diſqualified for the purple; but this ceremo'ny, which ſeemed to profane *the ſacraments* of the 'church,' &c.[2]; where the PAPIST unites with the deiſt, in making *orders* to be one of the *ſacraments*, and in ſneering at them. 'To her bloody deed, 'ſuperſtition has attributed a darkneſs of ſeventeen 'days,—as if the ſun—COULD ſympathiſe with the '*atoms* of a revolving planet[3];' where the author plainly betrays himſelf to be, what he ſo much endeavours to conceal, an actual and abſolute ATHEIST. —'Nor can we blame his puſillanimous reſigna'tion, ſince *a Greek Chriſtian was no longer maſter of* '*his life*[4]. This is another vindication of that horrible doctrine of SELF-MURDER, which this hiſtorian has ſo formally juſtified before. And we thus ſee him mounting in this ſingle chapter, by a natural gradation of profligacy, from popery to deiſm, to atheiſm, and to ſelf-murder.

Chapter the SECOND,

or forty-ninth.—This contains the hiſtory of what? of the *weſtern empire* again. We have an account of the Lombards, of the Romans, and of the Franks. We ſee the Romans renouncing the ſovereignty of Conſtantinople, the Lombards ſupporting it and attacking Rome, and the Franks marching over the Alps, cruſhing the Lombards, giving the popes a ſovereignty over Ravenna, and erecting for themſelves a new empire in the weſt. And we have the general hiſtory of this, of France, of Germany, and of Italy, to the fourteenth century. Thus doth the ghoſt of the weſtern empire, continue to haunt us ſtill.

---

[1] p. 60. [2] p. 11. [3] p. 27. [4] p. 84.

> The tomb, in which we ſaw it quietly in-urn'd,
> Hath op'd its ponderous and marble jaws
> To let it out again.

And we need only repeat what we have ſaid ſo often before, that Mr. Gibbon was merely to give us, according to his own acknowledgment, 'the moſt 'important circumſtances of the decline and fall' of the *eaſtern* empire. Indeed in all this long detail of things foreign and adventitious, we loſe ſight of the eaſtern empire almoſt entirely. We have only now and then a ſolitary and incidental mention of it. Our eye was very lately promiſed, to be 'always fixed upon the city of Conſtantinople;' yet we have merely one or two ſquinting looks at it. And Mr. Gibbon forgets equally his firſt and his laſt promiſes, in his overbearing love of the excentric and the extravagant.

The *harſh* or *falſe language* in this chapter, may be thus exemplified: 'the *ample meaſure* of the ex-

'archate[1],' for the *largeſt dimenſions*; 'he ſecretly '*edified* the throne of his ſucceſſors[2]; 'his coronation-oath *repreſents* a promiſe to maintain[3], &c. inſtead of contains; 'the *foundation*,' meaning the *erection*, 'of eight biſhopricks—*define* [defines]' for *marks*, 'on either ſide of the Weſer, the bounds of 'ancient Saxony[4];' and 'each city *filled* the *meaſure* 'of,' for *was commenſurate with*, 'her *dioceſe* or *diſtrict*[5].'

The following paſſages are proofs of *obſcurity*.—P. 90. 'the gracious and often ſupernatural favours, which, in the popular belief, were ſhowered round their tomb,' that of ſaints and martyrs, '*conveyed an unqueſtionable ſanction* of the devout 'pilgrims,' &c. What does this mean?——P. 116, 'at the next aſſembly, *the field of March or of May*, his injuries were,' &c.——P. 134, 'the 'reign of Adrian the Firſt ſurpaſſes the meaſure of 'paſt or ſucceeding ages,' in what? in *profligacy*, we ſuppoſe from the context, but in *number of years*, as the note intimates.——P. 159, 'their revenue, '*from minute and vexatious prerogative*, was ſcarcely 'ſufficient,' &c.

Nor are theſe paſſages more dark in the tranſcript, than they are in the original.

Contradictions.——In this chapter we come back to thoſe ſubſtantial pillars of hiſtory, notes and references. For want of them, the hiſtorical edifice before was only like a fairy fabric, reared upon a foundation of air, and glittering with the colours of the rainbow. But, as we recover our notes, we return alſo to the old oppoſition between them and the text. ‘ The inhabitants of the dutchy of Spoleto ‘ ſought a refuge from the ſtorm, declared *themſelves* ‘ the ſervants and ſubjects of St. Peter, and *com-* ‘ *pleted*, by this voluntary ſurrender, *the preſent circle* ‘ *of the eccleſiaſtical ſtate*[1].’ This is peremptory, for the ſurrender of *themſelves* and of their *country* to the popes. Yet the note, after citing the paſſage on which the text is founded, contradicts the latter in this manner: ‘ *it may be a queſtion*, whether ‘ they gave *their own perſons* or their *country*.’—— ‘ The king of the Franks and Lombards aſſerted ‘ the inalienable rights of the empire; and, in his ‘ life and death, *Ravenna*, as well as Rome, was ‘ numbered in the liſt of *his* metropolitical cities [2].’ Ravenna then was conſidered by Charlemagne, as *his* city. Yet the note ſays thus of him: ‘ *Charle-* ‘ *magne* ſolicited and obtained from the *proprietor* ‘ Adrian the Firſt, the moſaics of the *palace* of *Ra-* ‘ *venna*.’——‘ A ſynod of three hundred *biſhops* was ‘ aſſembled at Frankfort [3].’ But the ſubjoined note ſays, that this number ‘ muſt include, *not only* the ‘ *biſhops*, but the *abbots*, and even the *principal lay-* ‘ *men*.’—So much are the notes and the text, playing at croſs purpoſes with each other!

---

[1] P. 123. [2] p. 134. [3] p. 136. [4] p. 143. [5] p. 160.

Abſurdity.—‘ Both Selden—and Monteſquieu— ‘ repreſent Charlemagne, as the firſt *legal* author of ‘ tithes. Such obligations have country gentle- ‘ men to his memory!’ Country gentlemen have neither obligation, nor diſobligation, to the memory of Charlemagne, for this; unleſs Mr. Gibbon thinks that there are any of them, who poſſeſſed their eſtates *before* Charlemagne impoſed the payment of tithes. If they bought or inherited them, with the burden already upon them; they are not injured. But indeed it is only ignorance, in Mr. Gibbon, Monteſquieu, and Selden; that could attribute the firſt payment of tithes to Charlemagne. He reigned from the middle of the eighth century, to the beginning of the ninth. And Boniface, archbiſhop of Mentz but a native of England, who was born in 670; teſtifies tithes to have been paid by the *Engliſh* in his time, *one whole century* at leaſt before Charlemagne. They were paid undoubtedly; and *legally* too, or they would not have been paid at all; from the firſt legal eſtabliſhment of Chriſtianity, in the iſland and on the continent [1].

---

[1] p. 124. [2] ibid. [3] p. 131.

Chapter the THIRD,

or fiftieth.—This propoſes to give us 'the genius 'of the Arabian prophet, the manners of his na'tion, and the ſpirit of his religion;' which 'in'volve the cauſes of the decline and fall of the eaſt'ern empire [2].' We have accordingly, up to p. 196, an account of Arabia, its geography, its manners, its hiſtory, &c. To p. 219 we have Mahomet's parentage, life, and Koran, deſcribed; to p. 237 the ſucceſs of Mahomet in converting his own family, his expulſion from Mecca, his reception at

---

[1] Hiſt. of Mancheſter, II. quarto, 438—439.

[2] p. 170.

Medina, and his plundering expeditions in the deſerts of Arabia; to p. 240 his reduction of Mecca; and to p. 256 his hiſtory to his death. We thus have *eighty-ſix* quarto pages, one *eighth* of the whole volume, laid out in what is merely the *private* hiſtory (as if it were) of Mahomet. That the great and ſtriking principles of Mahometaniſm, and the marking features of Mahomet's character and life, ſhould have been produced before the reader; was requiſite to the illumination of the hiſtory. But nothing more was requiſite. And as this might have been executed in a quarter part of the ſpace actually taken, ſo would it have made a deeper impreſſion on the reader. But Mr. Gibbon has always an unhappy propenſity to diſſertation. He loves to ſpin his long web of threads, that are ready to break at every touch; while he lays his hiſtory fairly to ſlumber. He forgets, in his travels through Arabia, and during his reſidence in it, that he is writing the hiſtory of the decline and fall of the Roman empire; that, if one foot of his hiſtorical compaſſes may be ſtretched with propriety, for a ſhort time, into the deſerts there, it can only be for a ſhort time, and the other muſt remain centered and fixed at Conſtantinople all the while; and that his own reaſon has preſcribed, and his own pen has promiſed, to dwell only upon the 'important,' and the 'moſt important,' circumſtances of its decline and fall.

But Mr. Gibbon has inflamed the abſurdity of this devious chapter, by giving us a liſt and an account of Mahomet's ſucceſſors, Abubeker, Omar, Othman, and Ali, to p. 262; with an account of the civil war between the Mahometans, p. 262—265; the ſucceſſion of Moawiyah, and the change of government from elective to hereditary, p. 266—271; all 'anticipated' confeſſedly, and therefore containing a hint in p. 262, that the Mahometans had now reduced 'Perſia, Syria, and Egypt,' and in p. 267, that they were even beſieging Conſtantinople; when we have hardly ſeen them yet breaking out from Arabia. This 'anticipation' ſeems to be purely the reſult of wantonneſs, as we are afterwards to attend the progreſs of the Mahometan arms, and to accompany the armies of thoſe very men, Ali, Othman, Omar, and Abubeker, in their reduction of the countries. And the only reaſon, which he has aſſigned for this act of wantonneſs, is this; 'that the merit and misfortunes of Ali 'and his deſcendants lead him to *anticipate*, in this 'place, the ſeries of the Saracen caliphs.' The reaſon appears as trifling, as the conduct is extravagant.

The hiſtory in this chapter carries a peculiar air of *obſcurity* with it. It is very frequently unintelligible. And we are ready to invoke Œdipus, to come and explain the enigmatic paſſages. But we paſs over the *obſcure expreſſions*, and alſo the *falſe language*, in order to mark more fully ſome *contradictions* and ſome *abſurdities*.

'Mahomet *placed* himſelf, with Abubeker, on a '*throne* or *pulpit*[1].' So ſays the text. But what adds the note? 'The *place*, to which Mahomet *retired*

---

[1] p. 232.

'during the action, is ſtyled by Gagnier—*umbraculum, une loge de bois avec une porte.* The ſame 'Arabic word is rendered by Reiſke,—by *ſolium, 'ſuggeſtus editior*; and the difference is of the utmoſt moment, for the honour both of the interpreter and the hero.' Yet without ſettling or attempting to ſettle, by arguments in the note, this 'difference of the utmoſt moment;' Mr. Gibbon has decided it without any argument in the text, and fixed it to be 'a throne or pulpit.' And then the note comes to decide *againſt* this deciſion, to intimate the place may be ſome ſhed or cabin of wood, and to ſay that Mahomet 'retired' to it during the action.

Text. The '*dream* of a nocturnal journey is ſeriouſly deſcribed, as a real and corporeal tranſaction[1].' Note. 'The nocturnal *journey* is *circumſtantially related* by Abulſeda,—who *wiſhes* to 'think it a viſion.—Yet the Koran, without naming either heaven, or Jeruſalem, or Mecca, has 'only dropt a myſterious hint, *laus illi qui tranſtulit 'ſervum ſuum ab oratorio Haram ad oratorium remotiſſimum.*—A ſlender baſis for the aerial ſtructure 'of tradition!' Mr. Gibbon firſt makes the journey to be a *dream.* He then refers to Abulſeda, who makes it a *reality*; circumſtantially relating it, and only wiſhing, from the groſs abſurdity, to reſolve it (if he could) into a dream. And he next produces a paſſage from the Koran, which ſhews it deciſively to be a *reality.* He produces it in confirmation of the text, and in evidence of its being a *dream.* Yet it proves it *not* to be a dream, in the plaineſt manner. The paſſage praiſes God, for *tranſlating* his ſervant *from the oratory Haram,* &c.; '*tranſtulit* 'ſervum ſuum *ab oratorio Haram,*' &c. And Mr. Gibbon, who ſays the Koran mentions not Mecca, is deceived by his inattention; the 'oratorium Haram' being the temple of Mecca, which is called in Arabic *Masjad al Haram*, or ſimply *Al Haram* and *Haram*, the ſacred temple [1]; and Mr. Gibbon himſelf accordingly carrying Mahomet in the text, 'from 'the' very 'temple of Mecca [2].

---

[1] p. 211.

This *dream*, as Mr. Gibbon calls it, he thus deſcribes in ſhort. 'A myſterious animal, the Borax, 'conveyed him from the temple of Mecca to that 'of Jeruſalem; with his companion Gabriel, he 'ſucceſſively aſcended the ſeven heavens, and re'ceived and repaid the ſalutations of the patriarchs, 'the prophets, and the angels, in their reſpective 'manſions.' But let us dwell a little more particularly on this ſubject, than Mr. Gibbon chuſes to do. The *dreams* of ſuch a Homer as this in theology, are worth our attention. And as a narrative of this nocturnal journey will uſefully expoſe the credulity of thoſe, who, like Mr. Gibbon, think 'a 'philoſophical theiſt might ſubſcribe the popular 'creed of the Mahometans [3]; ſo I ſhall ſoon ſhew it to be a reality, even in the opinions of the Mahometans themſelves, and to form a fundamental article in that very creed. Al Borak then was an animal, which had a man's face, a horſe's jaws, eagle's wings, and eyes like ſtars; which could move as ſwift as the lightning, but *was informed with a rational ſoul*, yet had not naturally *the power of ſpeech*; which begged of Mahomet *to be introduced into heaven* at the day of judgment, and to which Mahomet actually *promiſed a place* there. This hippogryffin of Mahomet's carried him to the *temple* of Jeruſalem, where he met Abraham, Moſes, and OUR SAVIOUR, with a number of prophets and angels. Theſe all went to prayer with him. He then aſcended without the beaſt, and with only the angel Gabriel, to the firſt heaven; where he ſaw angels of all ſorts and ſhapes. Some were in the form of *birds*, and ſome in that of *beaſts*, being the angels that interceded *for birds and beaſts* reſpectively. One of the former was a *cock*, being the *angel of cocks*; and of ſo prodigious a ſize, that with his *head* he *touched* the ſecond heaven, though a *journey* of *five hundred years* above the firſt. In the ſecond heaven he ſaw another angel, *whoſe head reached up to the third*, though equally a *journey of five hundred years diſtant from it*. In the third, he ſaw another, who was ſo large and big, that the ſpace *between* his *eyes* only, was a diſtance equal to a *journey* of *ſeventy thouſand days*; an angel, according to the proportions of *this* part of his body, that could not *poſſibly* have ſtood *within any one, even of Mahomet's heavens*. In the fourth heaven he ſaw an angel, as tall as any before, and reaching equally in height a *journey of five hundred years*. In the fifth and ſixth he ſaw no more of theſe tall angels. But, in the ſeventh, he ſaw one with *ſeventy thouſand heads, ſeventy thouſand tongues in every head,* and *ſeventy thouſand diſtinct voices* coming at the ſame time from *every tongue*; and another with a *million* of *heads,* a *million* of *tongues,* and a *million* of *voices.* And, as he ſaw Abraham, Moſes, and OUR SAVIOUR, at Jeruſalem; ſo he ſaw Adam in the firſt heaven, OUR SAVIOUR *again,* and John, in the ſecond, David and Solomon in the third, Aaron and Enoch in the fifth, Moſes *again* in the ſixth, Abraham *again,* and *again* OUR SAVIOUR, in the ſeventh; and *recommended himſelf to the prayers of* OUR SAVIOUR, though all the other prophets and ſaints recommended *themſelves* to Mahomet's prayers. So truly in its *ſubſtance* is this nocturnal journey a *viſion* and a *dream,* even the dream of ſickneſs, and the viſion of inſanity! Yet it was all related by Mahomet, as a reality. *He related it the next morning.* But it was received, even by the credulous Arabs, with a general burſt of contempt. Some laughed at the extravagance of the fiction. Some were indignant at the effrontery of the impoſture. Mahomet was very properly challenged therefore, to aſcend up to the heavens again, not by night but by day, and in the ſight of them all. Yet this bold fiction was the grand hinge, upon which the prophetic character of the impoſtor turned. Could he not induce them to ſwallow ſuch fictions as theſe, he would have reſigned his title of a prophet, and have ſunk into a mere warrior. But they did ſwallow it. Their credulity was even as gigantic, as his falſehoods. And as Abubeker vouched *at the time*, for the *truth* and *reality* of all that Mahomet had related, when (according to Mr. Gibbon himſelf in a *diſtant* paſſage) ‘ the *veracity* of ‘ Abubeker *confirmed* the religion of the prophet[1];’ and as Mahomet introduces God in two parts of the Koran, ſwearing by the ſtars, &c. to the truth of Mahomet's admiſſion into his preſence: ſo, even in the early days of Omar the ſecond ſucceſſor to Mahomet, a Mahometan general alleges for the ſurrendery of Jeruſalem to him, that ‘ Mahomet him‘ ſelf went from it in one night to heaven;’ all the Mahometans in general have ever ſince conſidered a diſbelief of this journey, to be a diſbelief of the Koran itſelf; and all the Turks in particular obſerve a grand feſtival to this day, on the twentieth night of their month Rajed, for the very night in which this journey was performed[2]. To ſuch ſottiſhneſs of credulity are thoſe reduced, who would fly from the myſteries of Chriſtianity to the monſters of Mahometaniſm!

---

[1] Modern Univerſal Hiſt. 1. 207, 74, and 28, octavo.

[2] p. 211.

[3] p. 204.

Mahomet, ſays Mr. Gibbon, in this nocturnal journey, ‘ paſſed *the veil of unity*, and approached ‘ within *two bowſhots* of the throne, and felt a cold ‘ that pierced him to the heart, when his *ſhoulder* ‘ was touched by the *hand* of God[3].’ What is this ‘ veil of unity,’ and whence did Mr. Gibbon derive it? There is no ſuch ‘veil,’ I apprehend, in the Mahometan accounts of this journey. Nor what a ‘veil of unity’ means, is it eaſy to gueſs. And I ſuſpect Mr. Gibbon to have borrowed it, by ſome ſtrange miſconception, from *the ſeventy thouſand veils*, that this madman repreſents to have been before the face of God[1].’ As to the ‘two bow-ſhots,’ theſe have been corrected by a late author into *two bow-lengths*[2]; though this very author has forgot to adopt his own correction, in the progreſs of the hiſtory[3]. And, as to the *hand* of God applied to the *ſhoulder* of Mahomet, God is ſaid to have put *one* of his hands upon the *ſhoulder*, and *another upon the breaſt*, of Mahomet[4].

---

[1] P. 220.

[2] Prideaux's Life of Mahomet, p. 53—66, 2d Edit. 1697; and Modern Univ. Hiſt. 1. 65—81, and 424. [illegible]

[3] p. 211. So dogmatically [illegible]

[illegible]

‘In *the prophetic ſtyle*, which uſes *the preſent or* ‘*paſt for the future*, Mahomet had ſaid, *appropin*‘*quavit hora, et ſciſſa eſt luna.*—This figure of rhe‘toric has been converted into a fact, which is ſaid ‘to be atteſted by the moſt reſpectable witneſſes.— ‘The feſtival is ſtill celebrated by the Perſians[5].’ Mr. Gibbon here, and in the paſſage preceding, miſtakes totally the nature of the Koran. The hints in it have *not* been made ‘the baſis of tradi‘tions.’ The traditional is the *full* ſtory, and the Koran contains only the *abſtract* of it. We ſee this very evident in the paſſage before. The whole hiſtory of Mahomet's nocturnal journey, from the temple of Mecca to the ſeventh heaven; was *related*

---

[1] Prideaux, p. 63.

[2] Modern Univ. Hiſt. 1. 76.

[3] Ibid. 1. 424.

[4] Ibid. 1. 76.

[5] p. 212.

by himſelf the very next morning, to his countrymen of Mecca. Yet the Koran contains no more account of it, than this general one; that God 'tranſtulit ſervum ſuum ab oratorio Haram ad oratorium remotiſſimum;' not as Mr. Gibbon has wildly aſſerted before, 'without naming either Heaven, or Jeruſalem, or Mecca,' which would make the whole moſt amazingly ridiculous; but naming *Mecca* (as I have already ſhewn) by its cuſtomary appellation among the Arabs, *Masjed al Haram*, or temple Haram; and equally naming *Jeruſalem* aſſuredly, by its equally cuſtomary appellation among them, of *Masjed al Akſi* or *Akſa*, the farther temple, or the temple moſt remote, as the temple of Jeruſalem *is actually denominated by the Arabian Abulfeda himſelf*[1]. In the ideas of Mahomet himſelf, and of his followers for ages, there were only two temples in the world worthy of their notice, that of Mecca, and this of Jeruſalem; that they called the Holy Moſque, and this they denominated the Farther one. This paſſage in the Koran, therefore, is actually poſterior in time, to the recital of the ſtory the next morning; is to be explained by the tradition of it; and is accordingly explained ſo by the Mahometans themſelves, to this day. And the caſe is nearly ſimilar, with the preſent paſſage. It is no prophecy. It is merely, like the former, an intimation of a ſtory related by himſelf. Only here the intimation is as full as the relation, and the Koran *therefore* is a ſufficient witneſs of its own meaning. The Koran itſelf relates the incident, not as a future, but as a paſt, fact. 'The hour '*hath* approached,' it ſays, 'and the moon *hath* '*been* ſplit aſunder; but *if they ſee a ſign*, they turn 'aſide, ſaying *this is a powerful charm*; and they 'accuſe of *impoſture*,' &c.[1]. Here the context proves demonſtrably, that the *prophetic* interpretation of the paſſage is only a ſorry ſubterfuge of Mr. Gibbon's, equally againſt grammar and good-ſenſe. Mahomet here appears, actually alleging ſuch a miracle to have been wrought by him, and confeſſing the people not to have believed it. Even one of his *perſonal* followers, Ebn Maſud, affirmed he beheld the miracle with his own eyes; and even ſaw mount Hara, one of the hills near Mecca, appear at the time between the two diviſions of the moon[2]. Accordingly 'it is ſaid,' Mr. Gibbon himſelf tells us, 'to be atteſted by the moſt reſpectable eye-wit'neſſes.' And, as the fact is believed by the Mahometans in general[3]; ſo Mr Gibbon again allows 'the feſtival' of it, to be, 'ſtill celebrated by the 'Perſians' in particular. So unhappy is Mr Gibbon, in all his attempts to ſtrip Mahometaniſm, of its pretended miracles of action, and its real prodigies of abſurdity!

---

[1] Modern Univ. Hiſt. 3. 304.

Text. 'A ſmall portion of ground, the patri'mony of two orphans, was acquired by *gift* or *pur*'*chaſe*.' Note. 'Prideaux—reviles the wicked'neſs of the impoſtor, who deſpoiled two poor or-

---

[1] Modern Univ. Hiſt. 1. 62.

[2] Ibid. ibid.

[3] Ibid. ibid. and 84.

'phans, the ſons of a carpenter; a reproach which 'he drew from the Diſputatio contra Saracenos, 'compoſed in Arabic *before* the year 1130; but the '*honeſt* Gagnier—has *ſhewn*, that *they were deceived* 'by the word *Al Nagjar*, which ſignifies in this 'place, not an obſcure trade, but a noble tribe of 'Arabs. The deſolate ſtate of the ground is de'ſcribed by Abulfeda; and his *worthy* interpreter 'has proved, from Al Bochari, the *offer of a price*; 'from Al Jannabi, *the fair purchaſe*; and from Ah'med Ben Joſeph, *the payment of the money by the* '*generous Abubeker*. On theſe grounds *the prophet* '*muſt be honourably acquitted*[1].' We here ſee the zeal, with which Mr. Gibbon, taking the *honeſt* and *worthy* Gagnier for his aſſociate in the work, labours to prove the innocence of Mahomet in this tranſaction. But the evidence of Gagnier in favour of Mahomet, had been fairly ſtated before in Modern Univerſal Hiſtory[2]; and the reader too candidly left to judge, between the accuſation and the defence. Mr. Gibbon therefore has only the merit, of producing the evidence at ſecond hand. Nor can we after all ſay with Mr. Gibbon, that Mahomet 'muſt 'be honourably acquitted.' To aſſert that Prideaux and his author 'were deceived' into the ſtory, by miſtaking the name of an Arab tribe for the name of a buſineſs; is only to trifle with the reader. A *circumſtance*, like this, cannot in the remoteſt degree affect the *ſubſtance* of the ſtory. And, even in the point itſelf, whether a writer, who (as we ſhall inſtantly ſhew) lived in the court of a Saracen caliph, was likely to confound the name of a Saracen tribe, with that of a particular profeſſion, and to know the very language of the country, *worſe* than an European of the preſent century; or whether Peter of Toledo, who tranſlated the Arabic original into Latin, was likely to know it *worſe* than Gagnier, who *never ſaw the original,* and only gueſſed at it *through* and *againſt* the tranſlation; let common-ſenſe decide. 'It is recorded as an inſtance of his [Mahomet's] injuſtice,' ſays Prideaux on the authority of Diſputatio Chriſtiani, c. 4, 'that he violently 'diſpoſſeſſed certain poor orphans, the children of 'an inferior artificer a little before deceaſed, of the 'ground on which it,' a moſque at Medina, 'ſtood; 'and ſo founded this firſt fabric for his worſhip, 'with the like wickedneſs as he did his religion[1].' The work here alleged by Prideaux, ſays Mr. Gibbon, was written 'before the year 1130.' It was in all probability written *very long* before, as it was *then* tranſlated out of Arabic into Latin. It was written too, by one who actually held an office in the court of a Saracen caliph; and was addreſſed by him to his friend, a Mahometan[2]. It forms therefore a very important authority. Againſt it, is produced Al Bochari, who died in 869, Al Jannabi, whoſe hiſtory comes down to 1588, and Ahmed Ben Joſeph, who finiſhed his in 1599[3]. The only witneſs of moment againſt him, therefore, is Al Bochari. And he atteſts only ‘ the *offer* of a price;’ which is very conſiſtent with the relation of Prideaux's author, and indeed implies it. A price being only *offered*, and not *given*; it being inadequate, I ſuppoſe, and therefore refuſed; the ground was taken away by violence. Nor, even if we admit all the three witneſſes in favour of Mahomet, can he be acquitted. Al Bochari alleges, that a price was *offered*. But Al Jannabi denies this, ſays a price was *given*, and ſo ‘ a fair purchaſe’ was made by Mahomet. And then Ahmed Ben Joſeph comes, contradicts Al Jannabi, and avers no purchaſe to have been made by *Mahomet*, but the purchaſe to have been actually made by *Abubeker*, he paying the money. Thus do Mahomet's witneſſes confound themſelves, and confirm the accuſation. But let us conſider the ſtory, upon the face of all theſe teſtimonies united. From Al Bochari we learn, that a price was offered by Mahomet, and not accepted by the owners. From Prideaux's author we find, that the land was *then* taken away by Mahomet. From Ahmed Ben Joſeph we underſtand, that this violence was urged againſt Mahomet, as it is actually urged by Prideaux's author; and that *therefore* Abubeker paid for it the money, *which the owners had demanded for it. For this reaſon* Al Jannabi declares the ground to have been fairly purchaſed. And, as this appears to be nearly or wholly the real ſtate of the caſe, from Mahomet's living *ten* years after he had ſeized the ground, and built his moſque upon it[1], and from Abubeker's *then* ſucceeding Mahomet, and *then* paying the money; ſo the whole reflects all the diſgrace upon Mahomet, that Prideaux had caſt upon him for it. Mr. Gibbon thus appears unfortunate again, in his zeal for the honour of Mahometaniſm! Nor is it worth while perhaps to notice his confuſedneſs of ideas, in all this. His text ſpeaks of the land being 'acquired by *gift* or *purchaſe*.' Yet his note endeavours to diſprove all '*gift*,' by proving the whole a 'purchaſe.' And, even though he brings ſeveral authorities, for a price being either offered or given for the land; he intimates the land to be worth no price at all, as 'the *deſolate* ſtate of the ground,' he ſays 'is deſcribed by Abulfeda.' So much has the Mahometan here confounded the critic, in Mr. Gibbon!

---

[1] p. 227.

[2] Vol. 1. p. 95, 96.

---

[1] Prideaux's Life of Mahomet, p. 76.

[2] Prideaux's Letter to Deiſts, p. 163.

[3] Ibid. ibid. p. 157, 159, and 154.

'A friendly tribe, inſtructed *(I know not how)* in 'the art of ſieges, ſupplied him with a train of battering *rams* and *military engines*, with a body of 'five hundred *artificers*[2].' He ſhould have ſaid in propriety, juſt as the Mod. Univ. Hiſt. ſays, 'with 'battering rams, *catapults*, and *all other* military 'machines employed in ſuch operations; together 'with *the moſt ſkilful engineers to play them*; with 'which he was ſupplied by the tribe of *Daws*, the '*the moſt famous of all the Arabs for ſuch artificers*[3].' This would have reſolved his difficulty at once, concerning the derivation of ſuch knowledge to the tribe. It was common to *all* the Arabs. Only *this tribe* was *the moſt famous* among them for it. And accordingly Mahomet appears upon *another* occaſion, and in *another hiſtory*, to have 'battered the wall' of a town 'ſome days, with his *rams* and *other* military engines [1].'

---

[1] Prideaux's Life of Mahomet, p. 88. [2] p. 241.

[3] Mod. Univ. Hiſt. i. 185.

P. 233. 'Drams of ſilver.' Mr. Gibbon has here, and in 246, &c. &c. &c. confounded a *weight* with a *coin*. Theſe 'drams of ſilver' were *ſilver drachmæ*, current among all the orientals, and denominated *dirhems* by the Arabs [2].

Note. 'The *diploma ſecuritatis Ailenſibus* is atteſted by Ahmed Ben Joſeph, and the author *Libri ſplendorum* (Gagnier, Not. ad Abulfedam, p. 125); but Abulfeda himſelf, as well as Elmacin (Hiſt. Saracen. p. 11), though he owns Mahomet's regard for the Chriſtians (p. 13), *only* mention *peace* and *tribute*. In the year 1630, Sionita publiſhed at Paris the text and verſion, of Mahomet's patent in favour of the Chriſtians; which was admitted and reprobated by the oppoſite taſte of Salmaſius and Grotius (Bayle, MAHOMET. Rem. AA). Hottinger doubts of its authenticity (Hiſt. Orient. p. 237); Renaudot urges the conſent of the Mahometans (Hiſt. Patriarch. Alex. p. 169); but Moſheim ſhews the futility of their opinion, and inclines to believe it ſpurious. Yet Abulpharagius quotes the impoſtor's treaty with the Neſtorian patriarch (Aſſeman. Bibliot. Orient. tom. 11. p. 418), but Abul-

---

[1] Mod. Univ. Hiſt. 1. 152.

[2] Ibid. 1. 118, 194, 223, &c.

'pharagius was primate of the Jacobites[1].' I have cited this long note with all its pomp of erudition, in order to exhibit Mr. Gibbon *juſt as he would wiſh to be exhibited*; and to point out what he would *not* wiſh to have pointed out, the ſolemn trifling of all. What is the concluſion of this *parade* of authorities, and this *pageantry* of arguments? Who can tell? Is the diploma genuine or ſpurious? Reaſon encounters reaſon, authority claſhes with authority, and 'man drives man along.' This is very ridiculous in itſelf. But it is more ridiculous, when we conſider the intention of the note. It was drawn up *in order* to decide. And it is ſtill more ridiculous, when the note was to decide *in favour of the text*, and to *corroborate what it had ſaid*. 'To 'his Chriſtian ſubjects,' ſays the text, 'Mahomet 'readily granted *the ſecurity of their perſons*, the *free*'*dom of their trade*, the *property of their goods*, and '*the toleration of their worſhip*.' The note was then to prove as the text aſſerts. But Mr. Gibbon forgot his purpoſes, in the predominance of his learning. The note left the text in the lurch. And, oppoſing the text by alleging Elmacin and Abulfeda for only peace and tribute, it produces nothing ultimately in favour of it. The text is undoubtedly wrong, and the diploma is undoubtedly ſpurious. Mr. Gibbon, amidſt all his authorities and reaſons, has forgotten to produce a deciſive one of either. There is a 'particular in it,' ſays Prideaux concerning the diploma, 'which manifeſtly diſcovers the forgery. 'It makes Moawias, the ſon of Abu Sophian, to be

---

[1] p. 245.

'the *ſecretary* to the impoſtor, *who drew the inſtru-* '*ment*; whereas it is certain, that Moawias, with his 'father Abu Sophian, was *then in arms againſt him*; 'and it was not till the taking of Mecca, *which was* '*four years after*, that *they came in unto him*, and to ſave 'their lives embraced the impoſture [1].' But let me add what is ſtill more deciſive perhaps, that it is dated in the fourth month of the *fourth* year of the *Hegira*, or flight of Mahomet; when the *Hegira* was *not* made an æra of computation, till *eighteen* years after the flight [2]. The inſtrument is thus proved to be a forgery, by thoſe ſtrongeſt ſignatures of a forgery, two falſe dates! Mr. Gibbon's text, therefore, is entirely overthrown, and his note is completely ſuperſeded. His remark too, concerning this diploma, from 'Abulpharagius quoting the 'impoſtor's treaty with the Neſtorian patriarch;' and his reply to it, from 'Abulpharagius being 'the primate of the Jacobites;' is all confuſion. Abulpharagius was not 'primate of the Jacobites.' He was merely a *phyſician* among them [3]. And the treaty with the Neſtorian patriarch, was *ſix years after* the date of this diploma [4].

'*The perpetual independence* of the *Arabs* has been 'the theme of *praiſe*, among *ſtrangers* and *natives*; 'and the arts of controverſy transform this ſingular '*event*, into a prophecy and a miracle, in favour of 'the poſterity of Iſhmael. *Some exceptions*, that can 'neither be diſſembled nor eluded, render this

---

[1] Prideaux's Life of Mahomet, p. 157—158.

[2] Compare Prideaux's Life, p. 158 with p. 78.

[3] Ibid. Letter to Deiſts, p. 153.

[4] Modern Univ. Hiſt. 1. 205, 206.

'mode of reaſoning as indiſcreet as it is ſuperfluous.' He then mentions the exceptions, and adds: 'yet *theſe exceptions* are *temporary* or *local*; the BODY OF THE NATION HAS ESCAPED THE YOKE OF THE MOST POWERFUL MONARCHIES; the arms of *Seſoſtris* and *Cyrus*, of *Pompey* and *Trajan*, *could never atchieve the conqueſt of Arabia*; the preſent ſovereign of the *Turks* may exerciſe a *ſhadow* of juriſdiction, but his pride is reduced *to ſolicit the friendſhip of a people*, whom it is dangerous to provoke and *fruitleſs to attack*[1].' Thus does Mr. Gibbon, like a child at play, knock down his own fabrication of cards with his own hand! But, as he adds in a note, 'a nameleſs doctor (Univerſal Hiſt. Vol. XX. octavo edition) has formally *demonſtrated* the truth of Chriſtianity, by the independence of the Arabs. A critic, beſides the exceptions of fact,' which Mr. Gibbon has already allowed to be only *temporary* and *local*, and not to relate to *the main body of the people*; 'might diſpute the meaning of the text (Gen. xvi. 12.),' when he allows the *fact* to be *ſtrictly conſonant* to the *interpretation*, 'the extent of the application,' when his own allowance ſhews this, 'and the foundation of the pedigree,' when he does not dare to deny it, and when the very Arabs themſelves have always affirmed, and do ſtill affirm it. Mr. Gibbon, we ſee, could not be quiet becauſe he was beaten. He therefore returns to aſſault the baffling writer, a ſecond time. He thus a ſecond time proclaims his own rage, and betrays his own convictions, in the ſame inſtant. And the ſerpent, ſpent, ſtill gnawing upon the file, and ſtill unable to break it, expoſes his folly in his feebleneſs, and ſhrinks into his hole covered with blood and ſhame.

---

[1] P. 178—179.

‘ The writers of the Modern Univerſal Hiſtory (Vol. I. and II.) have compiled, in 850 folio pages, the life of Mahomet and the annals of the caliphs. They enjoyed the advantage of reading, and *ſometimes correcting*, the Arabic texts; yet, notwithſtanding their high-ſounding boaſts, I cannot find, after the concluſion of my work, that they have afforded *much* (if any) additional information. The dull maſs is not quickened by a ſpark of philoſophy or taſte; and the compilers indulge the criticiſm of acrimonious bigotry, againſt Boulainvilliers, Sale, Gagnier, and all who have treated Mahomet with favour, or *even juſtice*[1].’ The author of this arraigned portion of the Modern Univerſal Hiſtory, I can inform the public, was the ſame who aſſerted the independence of the Arabs, in ſo ſubſtantial a manner; the late Mr. Swinton of Oxford. Mr. Gibbon is angry at both theſe works, for the ſame reaſon; the honourable zeal for Chriſtianity and for truth, that pervades them. Yet in the Mahometan hiſtory, it ſeems, Mr. Gibbon has not derived *much*, if *any*, information from Mr. Swinton. If he has derived *any*, he has certainly *ſtolen* it; for he has made no acknowledgments. That he has however derived *much*, I am inclined to think from his own expreſ-

---

[1] p. 275.

32390

ſions. And indeed how can it be otherwiſe, when, (according to Mr. Gibbon himſelf) Mr. Swinton had 'the advantage of reading, and *ſometimes correcting*, the Arabic text?' But I could mention many paſſages, in which Mr. Gibbon has apparently copied Mr. Swinton. I ſhall haſtily cite one. In p. 221 Mr. Gibbon uſes the word 'vizir,' as an appropriate term among the Arabs, for a deputy and ſupporter; and ſays in the note, that he 'endeavours to preſerve the Arabian idiom, as far as he 'can feel it himſelf in a Latin or French tranſlation.' But he had the idiom preſerved before, and the word adopted in an Engliſh hiſtory. Mr. Swinton in i. 47—48, at this very point of the hiſtory, had uſed the term; and even ſubjoined a note to explain the meaning. 'Who,' ſays Mahomet there to his few followers, 'will *be* my *wazir* or aſſiſtant—and become my brother and my vicegerent?' and 'the 'word *wazir* or *viſir*,' adds a note,—'properly 'ſignifies a *porter* or *carrier of burdens*; but, in a 'more noble ſenſe, it is taken for a *privy counſellor*, 'or rather a *prime miniſter*, who is the perſon that '*bears the whole burden* of the adminiſtration.' At 'the commencement of the Turkiſh empire,—the 'office of *viſir* was finally eſtabliſhed, and continues to this day. *None of thoſe authors who have* '*favoured* the public with a hiſtory of *wazirs*, *ſeem* '*to have traced this ſupereminent dignity to its original* '*ſource*.' But I could point out alſo many paſſages of Mr. Gibbon's hiſtory, in which he might have borrowed to his advantage from Mr. Swinton. I have actually pointed out a remarkable one before. And upon the whole, and after examining both the hiſtories, I am compelled to ſay; that the darkneſs, the abruptneſs, and the unfairneſs of Mr. Gibbon's, render the reading of Mr. Swinton's abſolutely neceſſary, to the inveſtigation of the hiſtory and the acquirement of the truth. Mr. Swinton indeed *does* take pains, to expoſe the folly and to repel the effrontery of Sale, Gagnier, and Boulainvilliers, thoſe half-renegadoes from Chriſtianity and from reaſon. This was requiſite to the purity of the hiſtory. But I could produce many inſtances of his candour and fairneſs. I have actually produced a ſtriking one before. And, as to his 'acrimony,' I am glad that Mr. Gibbon *feels*, and I am ſure that he *retorts*, it. But THAT hiſtory, it ſeems 'is not quickened by a 'ſpark of philoſophy and taſte.' It certainly is wanting in vivacity and ſentiment. Mr. Swinton was *weak* enough, to give us ſubſtantial criticiſms for 'taſte,' and to ſubſtitute ſolid truths for 'philo'ſophy.' And, with all this *weakneſs*, he has actually given us a *body* of hiſtory, that wants indeed ſome nice proportions, ſome graces of movement, and ſome brilliancy of aſpect; and that yet will be ſurveyed with profit and ſatisfaction, when the dreſſed and painted *dolls* of the preſent day, will be caſt away with the fantaſtic faſhion that produced them.

I have more than once before noted the ſtrong turn of *obſcenity*, that runs through Mr. Gibbon's hiſtory. I have too much occaſion, to notice it here again. I will venture to cite a couple of paſſages.

'Seventy-two *houris*, or black-eyed girls,' ſays Mr. Gibbon concerning the ſenſual paradiſe of the Mahometans, 'of reſplendent beauty, blooming youth, 'virgin purity, and exquiſite ſenſibility, will be created for the uſe of the meaneſt believer; a moment of pleaſure will be prolonged to a thouſand 'years, and his faculties will be increaſed an hundred 'fold to render them worthy of his felicity [1].' Mr. Gibbon, we ſee, dwells upon the picture with peculiar reliſh. I even ſuſpect him to have added from his own pencil, two of the ſtrongeſt ſtrokes in it. But in the next page he returns to his feaſt of ſenſuality. 'Uſeleſs would be the reſurrection of the 'body,' he ſays in his own character or in that of a Mahometan, *and perhaps the difference is very little*; 'unleſs it were reſtored to the poſſeſſion and 'exerciſe of its *worthieſt* faculties; and the union of '*ſenſual* and intellectual *enjoyment* is *requiſite*, to *complete* the happineſs of the *double animal*, the perfect 'man.' This is ſufficient for a taſte of Mr. Gibbon's *libidinous* ſpirit. I need only *refer* to a ſlight quotation of obſcenity in p. 253, and to a very impudent quotation and paſſage in p. 254. And Mr. Gibbon ſeems to be equally happy, in any opportunity of ſhewing his infidelity, and in any occaſion of exhibiting his laſciviouſneſs.

Chapter FOURTH

or fifty-firſt.——In this chapter, after ſome prefatory matter, we have the reduction of Perſia by the

---

[1] P. 218.

Saracens (p. 283—295), a point of hiſtory, totally foreign to the decline and fall of the Roman empire; and ſtill more foreign (if poſſible) to a work that is to confine itſelf to the 'circumſtances,' the 'important,' and even 'the moſt' important, in the account of this decline and fall. We have then the reduction of Syria (p. 296—331), and of Egypt (p. 331—349), by them. We have next their conqueſt of Weſtern Africa, to the Atlantic (p. 349—363); all as foreign as that of Perſia, becauſe the hiſtory of it was finiſhed, when we cloſed the career of the weſtern empire. And we have finally the reduction of Spain, equally foreign with both (p. 364—381); and ſome remarks at the cloſe, to ſhew the triumph of the Arabick religion over that of Chriſtianity (p. 381—391). Had Mr. Gibbon materials, he would ſwell every chapter of digreſſion into a volume; and expand and dilate the hiſtory of the decline and fall of the empire, into a large library. Give me but a foot to ſtand upon, ſays this hiſtorical Archimedes, and I will ſhake and agitate the whole globe at my pleaſure. And he writes, and writes, and digreſſes, and includes one hiſtorical *parentheſis* within another, in an almoſt infinite ſeries.

From p. 276 to p. 296, we never think of the empire or emperor at all. In p. 303 we have the firſt mention of the latter. We then find him 'in 'his palace of Conſtantinople or Antioch.' And we ſee him, like the reader, 'awakened' to a feeling for the empire. In p. 296—331 the ſun of hiſtory riſes and ſhines upon the empire. But it then ſinks in the *weſt.* And it goes to ſhine *in other worlds.*

There is alſo great confuſion, in the ſeries of the hiſtory. The reduction of Perſia comes *firſt*, and is placed by Mr. Gibbon himſelf in p. 290, 'A. D. 637—651.' We are *next* preſented with 'the conqueſt of Tranſoxiana,' as p. 294 tells us, 'A. D. 710.' But we have *then* 'the invaſion of Syria, A. D. 632.' We thus, like a crab, go backwards in our courſe. And what ſhews the abſurdity of ſuch an irregular arrangement at once, we ſee the emperor in p. 303, 'awakened by the invaſion of Syria, the loſs of Boſra, and the danger of Damaſcus;' when, in the previous part of the hiſtory, events a thouſand times more formidable to him have happened, and the whole empire of the Perſians has been ſubdued by the Saracens.

Contradictions.—P. 287. 'The walls of Cteſiphon or Madayn, which had reſiſted the battering-rams of the Romans, would not have yielded to the *darts* of the Saracens.' Mr. Gibbon forgets, that he has already given them battering-rams *once*; and he knows not that he ought to have given them *twice.* But this ſtrange forgetfulneſs concerning himſelf, and this groſs miſtake concerning the Arabs, who had all the Greek engines of war; as we have already ſeen them, and ſhall ſee them ſtill more, having the Greek *coins* among them; runs through his whole hiſtory here, and lends a falſe colouring to it. Thus he ſays in p. 305, concerning the ſiege of Damaſcus; 'the art, the labour, the *mi-*

'*litary engines*, of the Greeks and Romans, are ſeldom to be ſound in the *ſimple*, though ſucceſsful, 'operations of the Saracens; *it was ſufficient for 'them*, to inveſt a city with arms rather than with 'trenches, to repel the ſallies of the beſieged, to attempt a ſtratagem or an aſſault, or to expect the 'progreſs of famine or diſcontent.' Yet he himſelf in p. 307 ſpeaks thus, concerning this very ſiege: 'Elmacin—notices the uſe of *Baliſtæ* by the Saracens (Hiſt. Saracen. p. 25, 32).' This is in A. D. 634. And A. D. 638 he notices ſtill in oppoſition to all, that 'the military engines, which battered 'the walls' of Alexandria, 'may be imputed to 'the art and labour of—Syrian allies' (p. 335).

We have already ſeen Mr. Gibbon, making ſtrange miſtakes about the *coins* of the Arabians. We ſee him making ſtill more, in this chapter. P. 289 he ſpeaks of 'twenty thouſand *drams*,' p. 293 of '*drams* of ſilver,' and p. 280 of '*drams* 'or pieces of ſilver;' when he ſhould have ſaid, *drachmæ* or *dirhems* of ſilver[1]! P. 327 he mentions 'two hundred thouſand pieces of *gold*;' and p. 279 'five pieces of *gold*;' when he ſhould have mentioned as many *dirhems* of *ſilver*[2]. P. 338 he notices 'two *pieces of gold*,' p. 349 'four millions 'three hundred thouſand *pieces of gold*,' p. 288 'thouſands of *pieces of gold*,' p. 294 'two thouſand *pieces of gold*,' and p. 325 'three hundred 'thouſand *pieces of gold*;' when he ſhould have ſpoken more ſpecifically, have turned his pieces of gold into *denarii* or *dinars*[1], and given us the correſpondent value in Engliſh money. We ſhould then have had ſome idea of the ſums intended; and not been left, as we now are, totally in the dark about them. And in p. 381, at laſt recovering the ſpecific name, he reckons 'twelve millions and forty-'five thouſand *dinars* or pieces of gold,' to be 'a-'bout *ſix* millions of ſterling money;' when the *dinar* appears to have been about 13*s.* 6*d.* in value[2], and the ſum conſequently is above *eight* millions.

---

[1] Mod. Univ. Hiſt. i. 433.

[2] Ibid. i. 471 and 379.

P. 345. Mr. Gibbon notices a point, as not diſcovered by 'the ſelf-ſufficient compilers of the 'Modern Univerſal Hiſtory.' This is another ſtroke at Mr. Swinton. But it cannot hurt his reputation. I may very ſafely ſay ſtill, that for truth, for facts, and ſometimes even for *characteriſtic* facts, we muſt refer to Mr. Swinton; though, for brilliancy and pointedneſs, we muſt go to Mr. Gibbon. And I cannot refrain from marking with ſurpriſe, the charge of 'ſelf-ſufficiency' from ſuch a writer as Mr. Gibbon. He who comes forward in his text, with ſuch an air of ſuperior obſervation; he who fills his notes with an hundred references, quotations, ſneers, ſarçaſms, and caricatures; and he, who appears in his notes and text, like another Briareus, wielding his hundred arms againſt heaven itſelf; even he taxes the *ſelf-ſufficiency* of Mr. Swinton. And the fact preſents us with a wonderful picture, of the blindneſs incident to the human mind, and of the partiality foſtered in the human heart. Mr. Gibbon would otherwiſe have never preſumed, to charge another with his own darling ſin. The giant, in compliment to himſelf, would have ſpared the pigmy. And Sir John Cutler, that king of miſers, would not have had the effrontery to accuſe a prudent œconomiſt, of avarice.

---

[1] Mod. Univ. Hiſt. 1. 488, Renaudot, 334 'aurei denarii,' Mod. Univ. Hiſt. 1. 433, Ibid. 11, 76, '2000 dinars,' and ibid. 1. 455.

[2] Ibid. 1. 196.

P. 344. ‘ Renaudot anſwers for verſions of the ‘ Bible, Hexapla, *Catenæ Patrum*, Commentaries ‘ (p. 170).’ This gives us an inſtance, of what I have previouſly dwelt upon, the unfaithfulneſs of Mr. Gibbon in his references. He has marked in Italics the Italiciſed words above. Yet *theſe very words* are not in Renaudot, p. 170. The paſſage runs thus: ‘ Verſionum ſacræ ſcripturæ, com‘ mentariorum, hexaplorum, et aliarum ejuſmodi ‘ lucubrationum.’ And this ſerves ſtrongly to confirm, all that I have ſaid of Mr. Gibbon before; ſuch a falſification of the paſſage as this, being either merely the reſult of his habitual careleſſneſs, or the wilful ſuggeſtion of his ſarcaſtic genius.

P. 299. The text mentions ‘ the ringing of ‘ bells.’ But the note ſays: ‘ I much doubt, whe‘ ther this expreſſion can be juſtified, by the text of ‘ *Al Wakidi* or the practice of the times.’ So far I note the paſſages, only to ſhew the contradiction between them. But the contradiction is heightened, as the note goes on. And I wiſh to aſcertain the point denied in it, and ſo to vindicate the text in oppoſition to the note. ‘ Ad Græcos, ſays Du

' cange (Gloſſar. med. et in fin. [infimæ] Græcitat. tom. 1. p. 774) campanarum uſus ſerius tranſit [tran*ſiit*], et etiamnum rariſſimus. The oldeſt example, which we can find in the Byzantine writers, is of the year 1040; but the Venetians pretend, that they introduced bells at Conſtantinople, in the ninth century.' This is a ſtriking ſpecimen of that ſpirit of learning, which overlooks the object directly under its feet, while it is gazing for it among the ſtars. At the very ſurrender of Jeruſalem to the Arabs, one of the articles impoſed by the conquerors on the Chriſtians, is this; that, ' they ſhall not *ring*, but only *toll*, their *bells*[1].' Very ſoon after this event, one Kais being aſked by the emperor concerning *Mahomet*, how at the time he had perceived himſelf inſpired; ſaid that ' ſometimes he heard a ſound reſembling *that of a bell*, but ſtronger and ſharper[2].' Then comes ' the ringing of bells' in the text, at the ſiege of Boſra. And, what is a remarkable concluſion to the whole, only *ſix* pages after Mr. Gibbon has adopted in the text, and *refuted* in the note, this early uſe of bells; and in his account of the cloſely following ſiege of Damaſcus; he himſelf ſays, that ' the ſignal was given by a ſtroke on the great *bell*[3].'

P. 312. Mr. Gibbon in the text ſpeaks of ' the fair of Abyla, about thirty miles from Damaſcus.' ' *Dair Abil Kodos*,' ſays a note, ' after retrenching

---

[1] Mod. Univ. Hiſt. 1. 429.

[2] Ibid. 1. 449—450.

[3] P. 307.

'the laſt word, the epithet *holy*; I *diſcover* the A'bila of Lyſanias, between Damaſcus and Helio'polis; the name (*Abil* ſignifies à vineyard) con'curs with the ſituation to juſtify my conjecture '(Reland Paleſtine. tom. I. p. 307, tom. II. p. '525—527).' This is all a ſeries of errors. The place is *not* a *town*. It is only a monaſtery. Mr. Gibbon's own narrative ſhews this plainly, 'The '*hermit*,' he ſays himſelf p. 314, 'was left alive, in 'the *ſolitary* ſcene of blood and devaſtation.' Dair Abil Kodos, therefore, *cannot* be the *town* of *Abila Lyſaniæ*, mentioned by Ptolemy[1].' Even if it could, *Mr. Gibbon* did not '*diſcover* the Abila of 'Lyſanias' in the name of Abil; D'Anville's map of the country diſcovering it for him, by making the modern name of 'Abyladys,' to be 'Abel.' Nor does the name ſignify the Holy *Dair* or Houſe of Abila, but the houſe of *the Holy Father*; the words at full length being *Dair Abi Al Kodos*, and only by eliſion contracted into *Dair Abi'l Kodos*. And, even if the *preſent* vines of Abila could anyways relate to its *ancient* name, the ſignification of *Abil*, a vineyard, can have no relation to the monaſtery; the *town* confeſſedly lying 'between Damaſcus and Heliopo'lis,' and is about *thirty* miles 'from the former; 'when Abil is not more than *twelve*; and the *mo'naſtery* being, not between Tripoli and *Harran*,' as Mod. Un. Hiſt. places it, an interval of region too large for any local diſcrimination, but (as I ſuppoſe was intended to be ſaid) betwixt Tripoli and

---

[1] Lib. v. p. 160. Bertius.

Scurura or Caraw, and being probably the preſent monaſtery of *Der Mar Tacob* to the weſt of Caraw, and far to the north of Abila [1].

I have noticed before, the mean and wretched love of *obſcenity* in Mr. Gibbon. He has yet to learn,

> That want of decency is want of ſenſe.

And he moſt ſhamefully breaks in upon all decency, in this chapter; wounding the delicacy of his reader in p. 278, with a long and impudent quotation in Latin, concerning a ſcene of Mahometan ſenſuality. Senſuality is the life and ſoul of Mahometaniſm. 'In the eyes of an inquiſitive polytheiſt,' ſays Mr. Gibbon *for that very reaſon*, I doubt not, 'it muſt 'appear worthy of the human and the divine na'ture [2].' 'It muſt appear' peculiarly '*worthy* of 'the *human*—nature;' becauſe it 'reſtores' this nature even in paradiſe, as we have ſeen before, 'to 'the poſſeſſion and exerciſe of its *worthieſt* facul'ties [3].'

There is an air of *obſcurity* in the narration too, that frequently diſtracts the reader. We cannot underſtand the hiſtory, unleſs we are previouſly acquainted with it. This obſcurity often lies alſo, in ſingle and detached ſentences.—'Perhaps the Perſians,' he ſays, 'who have been the maſters of the Jews, 'would aſſert the honour, a poor honour—of being '*their* maſters [4].' I give the paſſage as the preſs gives it me. Nor is the context more clear, than the extract. And what is the poſſible meaning of it?——Once the proverb of a diamond cutting a diamond; is very indiſcreetly uſed in the hiſtory. But the vulgarity is at once covered and betrayed; by this pedantry of learning: '*it was a maxim among the Greeks*, that, for the purpoſe of cutting a diamond, a diamond was the moſt effectual[1].' 'In the name of the city,' Jeruſalem, 'the profane prevailed over the ſacred[2].' He ſhould have ſaid in propriety, that the modern and the Roman prevailed over the ancient and the Jewiſh. '*Jeruſalem* was known to the devout Chriſtians—; but the *legal* and *popular* appellation of *Ælia*—has paſſed from the Romans to the Arabs.' The name of *Jeruſalem* was known equally to the Arabs, as to the Chriſtians. Nor was the appellation of *Ælia*, the *legal* and *popular* one. The town indeed is called only *Ælia*, in Omar's *ſecond* addreſs to the patriarch[3]. But it is called 'Ælia *or* Jeruſalem,' in his *firſt*[4]. And as in the nocturnal journey of Mahomet, we apprehend it is denominated *Jeruſalem* only[5]; ſo is it certainly denominated only *Jeruſalem* by the Roman hiſtorian Ammianus Marcellinus, about *two centuries and an half* after Adrian had impoſed the name of *Ælia* upon it[6]. *Ælia* therefore was the *legal* name, but *Jeruſalem* the *popular* one; among the very Romans firſt, and conſequently among the Arabs afterwards.

---

[1] Mod. Univ. Hiſt 1. 392—394. D'Anville's map, and map in Pococke, vol. 2d; corrected the one by the other.

[2] p. 382.

[3] p. 219.

[4] p. 383.

---

[1] p. 317.

[2] p. 320.

[3] Mod. Univ. Hiſt. 1. 431.

[4] ibid. 1. 430.

[5] Prideaux's Life, 54 and 64; and Mod. Univ. Hiſt. 1. 67 and 77.

[6] L. xxiii. c. 1. p. 350. Valeſii 'apud Hieroſolymam templum.'

We have ſeveral inſtances of *falſe language*, in this chapter: p. 349, 'two authentic liſts, of the preſent and of the twelfth century, *are circumſcribed within*,' that is, *contain only*, 'the reſpectable number of two thouſand ſeven hundred villages and towns' in Egypt; p. 325 'the *luxury* of Antioch,' for *the luxurious Antioch*, 'trembled and obeyed;' p. 327, 'bidding an eternal farewell to Syria, he—*abſolved the faith* of his ſubjects,' or, as he ſhould have ſaid, *he abſolved his ſubjects—from their fealty*; p. 318, they 'overturned,' for *overthrew*, 'a detachment of Greeks;' p. 355, 'the well-known cities of Bugia and Tangier *define*,' for *mark* 'the—limits of the Saracen victories;' p. 372, 'the maritime town of Gijon was the *term* of the lieutenant of Muſa;' and p. 375, 'from his *term* or column of Narbonne he returned.'

We have alſo one *contradiction*. P. 374. 'The Goths *were* purſued *beyond* the Pyrenean mountains.' So ſays the text. But the note *doubts* this. 'I much queſtion,' ſays the author *there*, 'whether Muſa ever paſſed the Pyrenees.' And yet the text in p. 376 repeats this much queſtioned aſſertion; and ſays poſitively, 'he was preparing to *re*-paſs the Pyrenees.'

The deſtruction of the Alexandrine library, is partly denied and partly excuſed. If it was only a library of divinity, it is *excuſed*; as 'a philoſopher may allow with a ſmile, that it was ulti-

'mately devoted to the benefit of mankind[1].' Into what a mere Vandal and Goth, does the leaden weight of infidelity ſink Mr. Gibbon! It is *denied*, becauſe two writers, both Chriſtian, both Egyptian, and both earlier than the relater himſelf, one of whom too has amply deſcribed the reduction of Alexandria; have *not* noticed the fact. But a *negative* argument is of no moment, in oppoſition to a *poſitive* one. The fact is poſitively related, and by an author of unqueſtionable merit, Abulpharagius. No accumulation of teſtimonies merely negative, can countervail this. Nor is the deſtruction ſaid by him to have been done, *at* the reduction of Alexandria, but *ſome time afterwards*. Yet, as Mr. Gibbon farther argues, this deſtruction 'is repugnant to the ſound and orthodox precept of the 'Mahometan caſuiſts;' a weak argument in itſelf, and annihilated by its own allowance immediately afterwards, that 'a more deſtructive zeal may perhaps be attributed to the firſt ſucceſſors of Mahomet.' 'In this inſtance' however, adds Mr. Gibbon, 'the *conflagration* would have ſpeedily expired 'in the deficiency of materials;' when, even according to his own account from Abulpharagius, the library was not burnt in *any general conflagration*; but 'the volumes of paper or parchment were diſtributed to the ſix thouſand baths of the city, and, 'ſuch was their incredible multitude, that ſix 'months were barely ſufficient for the conſumption

---

[1] Page 343—345.

'of this precious fuel;' and when the parchment or paper was uſed only for *lighting* the fires, not for forming them, and *therefore* laſted ſo long a time. The Roman writers too, ſays Mr. Gibbon, 'Aulus Gellius (Noctes Atticæ, vi. 17), Ammianus 'Marcellinus (xxii. 16), and Oroſius (L. vi. c. '15),—all ſpeak in the *paſt* tenſe; and the words 'of Ammianus are remarkably ſtrong, *fuerunt*,' &c. But this is only another inſtance of that *diſhoneſt management*, with which Mr. Gibbon garbles his quotations and references. All theſe writers ſpeak only, of *the library deſtroyed in Cæſar's time.* They may well therefore ſpeak 'in the paſt tenſe.' Gellius (vi. 17), ſays, 'ea omnia bello priore Alexan-'drino—incenſa ſunt.' Oroſius ſays (vi. 15), that the 'regia claſſis' was ordered to be burnt by Cæſar; 'ea flamma—quadraginta millia librorum—'exuſſit.' And Marcellinus (xxii. 16) adds, in the words cited by Mr. Gibbon, 'bibliothecæ fue-'runt in-æſtimabiles.' or *innumerabiles*, as Mr. Gibbon reads them; 'et loquitur monumentorum ve-'terum concinens fides,' &c. *What* does this conſenting teſtimony ſay? Mr. Gibbon *choſe to ſuppreſs it.* But it ſays, 'ſeptingenta voluminum millia—'*ſub dictatore Cæſare* conflagraſſe.' Mr. Gibbon thus quotes the authors for the *later* library, when they ſpeak only of the *former*; and, in Marcellinus, wilfully ſuppreſſes the very words that would have betrayed they did. Another library was formed after the deſtruction of this. Epiphanius, Tertullian, and

Chryſoſtom, prove deciſively its exiſtence[1]; as Abulpharagius ſhews us its termination. And the evidence of ſuch an hiſtorian as the latter, 'an author of eminent note in the Eaſt, as well among Mahometans as Chriſtians[2];' the coincidence of his teſtimony with that of Chryſoſtom, Tertullian, and Epiphanius; the vacuity that there would be in the hiſtory, from the want of it; its pointedneſs, and its circumſtantiality; leave us no room to doubt of the ſweeping deſtruction, that theſe friends and favourites of Mr. Gibbon's, theſe fanatic Goths and Vandals of Arabia, made of the collected literature of the world.

Chapter FIFTH,

or fifty-ſecond.—In this chapter we have an account, of the firſt ſiege of Conſtantinople, and of the ſecond, by the Arabs, and of their failure in both (p. 392—405); of the invaſion of France by them (p. 405—412), a point quite foreign to the ſubject; of the civil wars among the Saracens (p. 412—416), all equally foreign as *particular* hiſtory; of the revolt of the Saracens in Spain from the caliphs (p. 416—418), equally foreign; of the magnificence of the caliphs (p. 418—420), and its conſequences on their private and public happineſs (p. 421—422), equally foreign; of the introduction and progreſs of learning among the Saracens (p. 423—431), equally foreign; of their invaſion of the empire and reduction of Crete (p. 431—436); of their reduction of Sicily (p. 437—438), equally foreign; of their expeditions againſt Rome (p. 438—443), equally foreign; of their invaſion of the empire again (p. 443—447); the diſorderlineſs of the guards of the caliphs (p. 447—449), equally foreign; the riſe and progreſs of the Carmathians among the Saracens (p. 449—452), equally foreign; the revolt of the provinces from the caliphs (p. 452—458), equally foreign; and the ſucceſſes of the empire over them (p. 458—463). Mr. Gibbon is ſtrangely ſlumbering in this chapter, over his own ſcope and aim in the hiſtory. He forgets, that he is writing the hiſtory of the decline and fall of the eaſtern empire. He dreams that he is writing a hiſtory of the *Saracens*, and tracing the *caliphate* to its decline and fall. And, in conſequence of this deluſion, out of ſeventy-two pages in this chapter, there are only twenty-eight, that have a connexion with the hiſtory. The reſt is all the very impertinence of digreſſion.

---

[1] See a very uſeful note in Reimar's Dion Caſſius, p. 327; and another as uſeful in A. Marcellinus, Valeſii, p. 343.

[2] Prideaux, Letter, p. 15.

The hiſtory of the introduction and progreſs of learning among the Saracens, is endeavoured to be connected with the general hiſtory, by this argument. 'The ſword of the Saracens,' we are told at the cloſe, 'became leſs formidable, when their 'youth was drawn away from the camp to the col'lege[1].' But, *had* this been the caſe, the introduction and the progreſs ſhould have been only *noticed*, not *dwelt upon*. And it is *not* the caſe, even upon the face of Mr. Gibbon's own hiſtory. For, on reſuming the narrative after this account, we find not, as we have a right to expect, this obſervation exemplified in the conduct of the Saracens. We find indeed the reverſe of this. We find them *more* triumphant than ever, over the empire; even impoſing a tribute upon it[1], even inſulting the emperor moſt groſsly[2], and even impreſſing 'the 'coin of the tribute with the image and ſuperſcrip'tion,' of the caliph[3]. Crete and Sicily, too, are ſubdued by that very king 'Almamon,' who was 'engaged in the introduction of foreign ſcience[4].' The Arabs alſo defeat the army of the empire, in a grand battle afterwards[5]. And the *future* weakneſs of the caliphs is actually aſcribed by Mr. Gibbon himſelf, to 'the diſorders of the Turkiſh 'guards[6],' to 'the riſe and progreſs of the Car'mathians[7],' and to 'the revolt of the provinces[8].' With ſuch a ſtumbling pace does Mr Gibbon proceed in his hiſtory!

---

[1] P. 431.

He ſays thus concerning Crete: 'I cannot con'ceive that mountainous iſland, to *ſurpaſs*, or even 'to *equal*, in *fertility* the *greater part* of Spain[9].' So ſpeaks the note. But, in the very next page, the text tells us of ſome *Spaniſh* Arabs, whom he calls 'a band of Andaluſian volunteers[10];' that

---

[1] p. 432.
[2] p. 433.
[3] p. 434.
[4] p. 434—438.
[5] p. 444—445.
[6] p. 447—448.
[7] p. 449—452.
[8] p. 452—456.
[9] p. 435.
[10] p. 435.

'they ſaw, they *taſted*, they *envied*, the *fertility* of 'Crete.'——'In the—city of Mopſueſtia,' ſays the text, '—two hundred thouſand Moſlems were 'deſtined to death or ſlavery; a ſurpriſing degree 'of population, which muſt at leaſt include the 'inhabitants of the dependent diſtricts[1]. But the note adds: 'yet I cannot credit this extreme po'pulouſneſs.' Then why did he inſert in it his text?——We are told, 'that the liberal Alma'mon was *ſufficiently* engaged in the reſtoration 'of domeſtic peace, and the introduction of foreign 'ſcience;' and in *the very next* words are further told, that, 'under the reign of Almamon,—the 'iſlands of Crete and Sicily were ſubdued by the 'Arabs[2].'

'They breathed at Dorylæum, at the diſtance 'of three days[3];' that is, three days after their flight they reſted at Dorylæum. 'Their retreat '*exaſperated the quarrel* of the townſmen and mer'cenaries[4],' that is, occaſioned a quarrel between them, as we *have heard of none exiſting before.* 'From—Elmacin and the Arabian phyſicians, ſome 'dinars as high as two dirhems—may be *deduced*[5],' that is, *it may be deduced that there were ſuch.* 'Three thouſand pieces of gold[6]' ſhould be as in Mr. Swinton, we apprehend, 'three thouſand 'pounds weight of gold[7].' 'The gold dinars,' which the Saracens now coined in their own mints,

---

[1] p. 460. [2] p. 435. [3] p. 444. [4] p. 461.
[5] p. 397. [6] p. 395.
[7] Mod. Univ. Hiſt. 11. 78.

‘ may be—equivalent to eight ſhillings of our ſter‘ ling money[1]:’ when there are nine very fine dinars, at this time preſerved in the Bodleian collection at Oxford; and there was another lately in that of the Rev. Mr. Brown, fellow of Trinity college there; ‘ whoſe *value*,’ ſays Mr. Swinton expreſsly, ‘ according to *weight*, amounts to about ‘ *thirteen ſhillings and ſixpence*,’ Engliſh money[2]. ‘ I ‘ have reckoned the gold pieces,’ meaning (as he *ſhould* have *ſaid*) the *dinars*, ‘ at eight ſhillings[3];’ when he ought to have reckoned them *at leaſt*, for thirteen ſhillings and ſixpence. ‘ One million of ‘ pieces of gold,’ he ſhould again have ſaid *dinars*, ‘ about four hundred thouſand pounds ſterling[4];’ above ſeven hundred and fifty thouſand pounds. And a perſon ‘ *conſecrates* a ſum of two hundred ‘ thouſand *pieces of gold*, to the foundation of a col‘ lege at Bagdad, which he endowed with an ample ‘ revenue of fifteen thouſand *dinars*[5];’ when the dinars and the pieces of gold are the ſame in reality, though they are diſtinguiſhed ſo much by name.

Chapter SIXTH,

or fifty-third.——This chapter contains an account, of the ‘ royal volumes of Conſtantine Porphyroge‘ nitus’ (p. 464—468), and of ‘ the Legatio ‘ Liutprandi, Epiſcopi Cremonenſis ad Nicepho-

---

[1] p. 397

[2] Modern Univ. Hiſt. i. 196.

[3] p. 419.

[4] p. 438.

[5] p. 424.

'rum Phocam' (p. 468), as the ſources of intelligence for Mr. Gibbon's preſent chapter; of the preſent ſtate of the provinces of the empire (p. 468—470); of the general wealth and populouſneſs of the empire (p. 471—472); of the particular ſtate of Peloponneſus (p. 472—478); of the revenue of the empire (478—479); of the pomp and luxury of the emperors (p. 479—483); of the honours and titles of the imperial family (p. 483—485); of the titles and names for the officers of the palace, the army, and the ſtate (p. 485—487); of the adoration paid to the emperor, reception of ambaſſadors, proceſſions, and acclamations (p. 487—490); marriage of the Cæſars with foreign nations, imaginary law of Conſtantine forbidding it, firſt exception, ſecond, third, &c. (p. 490—494); deſpotic power and coronation-oath of the emperor (p. 495—496); military force of the Greeks, Saracens, and Franks (p. 496—499); tactics and character of the Greeks (p. 500—502); tactics and character of the Saracens (p. 502—504); the Franks or Latins (p. 504—506); their character and tactics (p. 506—508); the diſuſe of the Latin language (p. 508—511); the period of ignorance (p. 511—512); the revival of Greek learning (p. 512—515); decay of taſte and genius (p. 515—517), and want of national emulation (p. 517—518). Theſe are points, ſome more proper for a note than the text, ſome ſo wildly devious from his ſubject, and all ſo petty and unintereſting; that I need only contraſt them with the often cited promiſe, of giving merely 'the circumſtances,' the 'important' circumſtances, and the 'moſt important,' of the decline and fall of the empire. And we cannot cenſure this labyrinth of digreſſions and minutiæ with more ſeverity, than by thus contraſting it and the promiſe together.

Obſcure. 'At length the approach of their hoſtile brethren extorted a golden bull, to define the 'rights and obligations of the Ezzerites and Milengi[1].' This is darker than the Delphic oracle.——'Yet the maxims of antiquity are ſtill embraced 'by a monarch formidable to his enemies;' who is this? 'by a republic reſpectable to her allies[2];' which is this?——'The Franks, the Barbarians, 'and the *Varangi or Engliſh*[3];' who are theſe? We know not and we cannot gueſs, till we come *two chapters afterward*, to find ſome Scandinavian pirates 'ſaluted with the title of *Varangians* or corſairs[4];' and till in the page *following* we ſee, that 'the new *Varangians* were a colony of *Engliſh* and *Danes*, who '*fled from the yoke of the Norman conqueror*[5].'——'This ſcholar ſhould be likewiſe a ſoldier; and 'alas! Quintus Icilius is no more[6].' We underſtand not this, till we come to a very diſtant page; where we find that 'Q. Icilius (M. Guiſchard)' analyſed the operations of Cæſar's campaigns in Africa and Spain[7]. So ſtrangely does Mr. Gibbon write, to uſe ſingular and extraordinary appellations without any explanation, and then to re-uſe them with one. His hiſtory is thus like a *glow-worm,* and carries its light in its tail.

---

[1] p. 473. [2] p. 479. [3] p. 486—487. [4] p. 561. [5] p. 562. [6] p. 467. [7] p. 616.

Falſe Engliſh. He mentions 'a golden bull to 'define the rights and obligations of the Ezzerites 'and Milengi, whoſe annual tribute was *defined,*' for *fixed,* 'at twelve hundred pieces of gold[1],' that is, *dinars,* ſomething more than our old *marks.*——'By this impious alliance he *accompliſhed,*' for *compleated,* 'the meaſure of his crimes[2].'——'No conſideration could diſpenſe *from,*' read *with,* 'the 'law of Conſtantine[3].'——'Diſcern and oppreſs the '*laſſitude* of their foes[4].'

Contradiction. After various intimations in the text, concerning the ſcandalous conduct of Hugo's family; and after ſeveral references to and quotations from Biſhop Liutprand in the note, as a deciſive authority for them; Mr. Gibbon ſweeps away at once the note and the text from the face of *authentic* hiſtory, by this daſhing ſtroke at the cloſe; 'yet it muſt not be forgot, that the Biſhop 'of Cremona was a lover of ſcandal[5].' Such an unlucky hand has Mr. Gibbon, in ſetting aſide *his own* authorities, and in overthrowing *his own* narrative!

Chapter SEVENTH

or fifty-fourth.—This chapter propoſes to be 'ſome '*inquiry* into the doctrine and ſtory,' of whom? 'of

---

[1] p. 473. [2] p. 492. [3] ibid.
[4] p 504. [5] p. 493.

'the *Paulicians*' (p. 520). Theſe, 'I am confident,' ſays Mr. Gibbon, 'gloried in their affinity to 'the apoſtle of the Gentiles' (p. 521). He accordingly recounts their origin (p. 522); their ſcriptures (p. 523); their not worſhipping images, relics, or ſaints; their conſidering the true croſs as a mere piece of wood, and the body and blood of Chriſt as mere bread and wine (p. 523); their quaker-like rejection of baptiſm and communion (p. 523); their condemning the Old Teſtament, as the invention of men and dæmons (p. 524); their allowing the godhead, but denying the perſonality, of Chriſt; giving him a body merely ſpiritual, that was not bound and could not be crucified (p. 524); and holding a god of goodneſs and a god of malignity (p. 524); their looſely ſpreading over the provinces of Aſia Minor (p. 525), the perſecution of them (p. 526—528), their revolt (p. 528—530), their decline in one part of the empire (p. 530), and their tranſplantation from another (p. 531); their continuance in their new ſettlement (p 531—533), their diſſemination from thence into the Weſt (p. 533—534), their perſecution there (p. 534—536), and their being the beginners of the Reformation (p. 536); with an eſſay at the end of all, on the character and conſequences of the Reformation (p. 536—540). This is obviouſly ſuch a detail of little and inſignificant points, ſo far as it relates to the empire at all; and ſuch a mere diſſertation on eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, in all the great remainder; as is equally contrary to his promiſe, and repugnant to his purpoſe. The pope claims all temporal authority '*in ordine ad* ſpiri- 'tualia.' And Mr. Gibbon, like an infallible monarch in hiſtory, abſolves himſelf from the obligations of his promiſes, abſolves himſelf from all proprieties of conduct, and arrogates every part of hiſtory, eccleſiaſtical or civil; *in order to* the hiſtory of the Roman empire, the hiſtory only of its decline and fall, and the hiſtory only of the moſt important circumſtances in either.

'We cannot be ſurpriſed, that they ſhould have 'found in the goſpel, the orthodox myſtery of the 'trinity;—the rational Chriſtian—was offended, 'that the Paulicians ſhould dare to violate the 'unity of God;—their belief and their truſt was in 'the Father, of Chriſt, of the human ſoul, and of 'the inviſible world[1].'——This ſeems to me as contradictory, as it is abſurd.——'They likewiſe 'held the eternity of matter, a ſtubborn and re- 'bellious ſubſtance, the origin of a ſecond prin- 'ciple, of an active being, who has created 'this viſible world,' &c[2]. Is the ſtrangeneſs here, the reſult of folly in theſe Paulicians, or of injudiciouſneſs in their hiſtorian?

Chapter EIGHTH

or, fifty-fifth.—This chapter relates the tranſactions of the Bulgarians with the empire (p. 542—

---

[1] p. 524.

[2] ibid.

547); the origin of the Hungarians (p. 548—551); the tactics of the Hungarians and Bulgarians (p. 551—553); the inroads of the Hungarians into Germany, Eaſtern France, and Italy (p. 553—556), all foreign to the hiſtory of the empire, and doubly foreign to the hiſtory of its decline and fall; the Hungarian reduction of the Bulgarians, and inroad up to the gates of Conſtantinople (p. 546); the expulſion of the Hungarians from Germany (p. 556—559), all equally foreign; origin of the Ruſſians (p. 560—563), geography and commerce of Ruſſia (p. 563—566), the wars of the Ruſſians with the empire (p. 566—574), and the converſion of the Ruſſians to Chriſtianity (p. 574—579). The chapter therefore contains many parts, that have not the ſlighteſt connexion with Mr. Gibbon's ſubject. And, even in ſuch as have a connexion, the thread of hiſtory is evidently ſpun too fine and long. The *facts* bear little proportion to the *diſquiſitions*. A large fabric is reared upon a ſlender pillar. And Mr. Gibbon's vaſt ſyſtem of hiſtory, like that of the univerſe, moves for ever upon an imaginary pole.

'If in my account of this intereſting people 'the Saracens,' ſays Mr. Gibbon, '*I have deviated* '*from the ſtrict and original line* of my undertaking, 'the *merit* of the ſubject will *hide my tranſgreſſion*, 'or *ſolicit my excuſe*[*].' I have already ſhewn him to have 'deviated' moſt wildly from 'the ſtrict,' and alſo from the 'original, line of his undertaking.' He here acknowledges in effect, that he has. But he hopes his 'tranſgreſſion' will be hid, or at leaſt his 'excuſe' will be 'ſolicited,' by 'the merit of 'the ſubject.' Yet his 'excuſe' may be 'ſolicited,' and his 'tranſgreſſion' will ſtill not be 'hid.' He has even pleaded 'the *merit* and miſfortunes of Ali and his deſcendants' before, for confeſſedly '*anticipating*—the ſeries of the Saracen 'caliphs[1].' But no 'merit of a ſubject' can alter the unchangeable law of propriety. And whatever Mr. Gibbon may wiſh to ſuggeſt in extenuation of his conduct, it is not one particular ſubject that has carried him off in a *parabola*; it is many an one, it is almoſt every one. The *centripetal* power in him is very weak. The *centrifugal* is very ſtrong. And he is perpetually flying off in a tangent, and running away into the wilds of ſpace.

---

[*] p. 541.

Contradictions. Text. 'The Hungarian language—bears a cloſe and clear affinity to the 'idioms of the Fennic race[2].' Note. 'I read in 'the learned Bayer—, that although the Hungarian 'has adopted *many* Fennic words (*innumeras* voces), 'it *eſſentially* differs, *toto genio et naturâ.*' Where then is, or where can be, the 'cloſe and clear affinity,' in it 'to the *idioms* of the Fennic race;' when 'the whole genius and nature' of *that* is 'eſſentially' different from *this?*

Falſe language. P. 552. 'Their ſole induſtry was 'the *hand* of violence and rapine;' p. 554 'their—'ſettlements extended—beyond the *meaſure*,' read *bounds*, 'of the Roman province of Pannonia;' p.

---

[1] p. 256—271.

[2] p. 550.

557, ‘ prevent their ſecond diſcharge by the—*career* ‘ of your lances;’—‘ Otho *diſpelled* the conſpiracy;’ p. 558, ‘ the *reſources* of diſcipline and valour were ‘ *fortified* by the arts of ſuperſtition;’ p. 574, ‘ Conſtantinople was *aſtoniſhed to applaud,*’ read *with aſtoniſhment applauded,* ‘ the martial virtues of her ſove‘ reign;’ and p. 577 ‘ a religion—different—from ‘ the worſhip of their native idols,’ *worſhip* made a *religion!*

Chapter NINTH,

and fifty-ſixth.—This gives us the wars of the Greeks, Latins, and Saracens in Italy (p. 580—587), all foreign; the wars of the Normans with all three in the ſame country (p. 587—594), all equally foreign; the wars of the Normans with the Latins only (p. 594—598), ſtill more foreign; the pedigree and character of Robert Guiſcard the Norman (p. 598—601); his general ſucceſs againſt the Latins, the Greeks, and the Saracens, in Italy and Sicily (p. 601—603), ſtill foreign, as ſtill within the ground of the late empire of the Weſt; his particular ſucceſſes in Italy (p. 603—604), ſtill foreign; the learning of Salerno, one of his new acquiſitions (p. 604), a digreſſion upon the back of a digreſſion; the trade of Amalphi, another of his acquiſitions (p. 605—606), another digreſſion upon the back of the firſt; the conqueſt of Sicily from the Saracens by his brother Roger (p. 606—609), ſtill foreign; Robert's invaſion of the empire (p. 609—620); the expedition of Henry the emperor of Germany againſt Rome (p. 621—623), ſtill foreign;

reign; Robert's re-invaſion of the empire (p. 623—626); the conduct of Robert's brother Roger, againſt his Norman brethren, the pope, and the Piſans, in Sicily and Italy (p. 626—629), ſtill foreign; his ſucceſſes over the Saracens in the Weſt of Africa (p. 629—631), ſtill foreign; his invaſion of the empire (p. 631—633); the invaſion of Italy by the emperor (p. 633—637), ſtill foreign; the laſt invaſion of the empire by the Normans (p. 638—644); and the wars of the Normans and Germans in Italy and Sicily (p. 638—644), again foreign. The chapter thus gives us a lively picture, of the digreſſional ſpirit of the author. Out of the ſeventeen points which I have here enumerated, five only relate even diſtantly to his ſubject, and twelve are the mere ſupplement of injudiciouſneſs and extravagance. And Mr. Gibbon's hiſtory is become like the great whirlpool of Norway, that is ſo terribly denominated *the navel of the ſea*; and ſucks into its eddy, bears, whales, ſhips, and every thing, that come within any poſſible reach of its engulphing ſtreams.

Falſe language. P. 612. 'The *proviſions* were 'either *drowned* or damaged;' p. 631, 'the venerable *age* of Athens—was *violated* by rapine and 'cruelty;' and p. 639, '*the aſcendant* of the eunuchs,' for *the principal* of them.

Contradiction. The pope '*conferred* on Robert and 'his poſterity—all the lands,' &c. 'This *apoſtolic* '*ſanction* might juſtify his arms, but [1],' &c. The text thus ſays poſitively, that the pope *did* confer theſe lands. The note accordingly adds, that 'Baronius—*has* publiſhed *the original act*:' Yet, after all, Mr Gibbon remarks with equal weakneſs and contradictorineſs, that Baronius, 'profeſſes to 'have copied it from—a Vatican M.'S.;' but that 'the names of Vatican and Cardinal awaken the '*ſuſpicions* of a proteſtant, and even of a philoſo-'pher.' Mr. Gibbon thus *ſuſpects* the truth, of what he himſelf has aſſerted peremptorily. And he often throws in a daſh of his ſceptical pen, as we have ſeen before, in this ſelf-confounding manner. Indeed *he* may well doubt the evidence of *others*, who is often doubting the teſtimony of *himſelf*.

---

[1] P. 601—602.

Chapter TENTH,

or fifty-ſeventh:——This exhibits to us the hiſtory of that greateſt of the Turkiſh princes, who reigned in the eaſtern provinces of Perſia, and ſubdued Hindoſtan (p. 645—651), all foreign as *particular* hiſtory; general manners of the Turkmans, eaſt and weſt of the Caſpian (p. 651); firſt emigration of the eaſtern to their reduction of Perſia (p. 652—653), all foreign; their hiſtory in Perſia (p. 654—656) ſtill foreign; their conduct to the Saracen caliphs (p. 656—658), ſtill foreign; their invaſion of the empire (p. 658—666); the death of their ſovereign (p. 666—667); the general ſucceſſes of the next ſovereign, in Turkeſtan, in the Tartary ad-

joining

joining to China, in Arabia Felix, and in the empire (p. 667—669); ſtill foreign for every part but the laſt; the manners of this ſovereign (p. 669—670), his death (p. 670—672), and diviſion of his empire into three parts (p. 672—673), all foreign as particular; reduction of Aſia Minor by the Turks (p. 673—677); and ſtate of Jeruſalem under the caliphs and under the Turks (p. 677—684), ſtill foreign, as reſpecting a city that had long been rent from the empire. Thus does Mr. Gibbon perſiſt to the end of the volume, in that extravagant ſpirit of rambling with which he began it. He promiſed indeed at his outſet, to give us only 'the moſt important circumſtances' of the decline and fall of the *empire*. He promiſed alſo, at the commencement of *this* volume, *not* to ſpin ſuch a prolix and ſlender thread of hiſtory, as he had ſpun through the four volumes preceding. And he has kept both his promiſes, by giving us the moſt *un*-important circumſtances in that of the *empire*, by giving us the circumſtances of the decline and fall of *every* empire connected with it, by ſpinning his thread of hiſtory ſtill more ſlender and more prolix, and ſo making his very reformation the cauſe and cover of greater tranſgreſſions. Nor muſt we cenſure Mr. Gibbon very ſharply, however ſharply we may cenſure his hiſtory, for this. *He cannot help it.* He has a clear and ſtrong judgment. This ſhews him the right line, in which he ſhould move. But he has a powerful principle within him, that is always carrying him off from it, and twiſting his courſe into obliquities upon one ſide and into curvatures on the other. And his right line, as traced by a critical eye through the long range of his volumes, is nothing but a ſeries of zigzags.

CHAPTER THE FOURTH.

HAVING gone over the fourth and fifth volumes of this extenſive hiſtory, we now come to the SIXTH and laſt.

Chapter FIRST,

or fifty-eighth.——In this we have the preaching up of the firſt cruſade by Peter the Hermit, 1—3; the pope calling a council to promote it, 3—5; his calling a ſecond council, 5—8; an inquiry into the juſtice of the cruſade, 8—11; the ſpiritual motives to it, 11—14; the temporal, 14—17; the march of the vanguard of cruſaders to Conſtantinople, 16—21; the leaders of the main body, 21—26; the march of this to Conſtantinople, 26—32; the conduct of the emperor towards them, 32—34; their doing homage to him, 34—37; the inſolence of one of their officers to him, 37—38; the numbers, nations, and character of their army, when reviewed in Aſia, 38—40; Nice, the capital of the Turks, taken by them, 40—42; their defeat of the Turkiſh ſultan, 42—44; their march through Aſia Minor, 44—45; one of them founding a principality *beyond the bounds of the empire*, 45; their reduction of Antioch, 46—48; their being beſieged in it themſelves, 48—49; their ſallying out and defeating the beſiegers, 49; their diſtreſs before they ſallied out, 49—51; their ſallying out in conſequence of a pretended miracle, 51—53; their defeating the Mahometans in conſequence of this and another, 53—54; the former endeavoured to be proved a fiction, 54—55; the ſtate of the Turks and Saracens at this period, 55—56; the ſlow proceedings of the cruſaders, 56—57; their march towards Jeruſalem, 57; their ſiege and reduction of Jeruſalem, 59—61; their appointment of one of them to the throne of Jeruſalem, 61—62; their defeating the Saracens of Egypt, 62; the extent and ſtrength of their kingdom of Jeruſalem, 63—66; its feudal tenures, 66—67; its feudal courts, 67—68; its mode of determining ſuits by combats, 68—70; its court of burgeſſes, 70; its Syrian ſubjects, 70—71; and its villains and ſlaves, 71. From this detail, therefore, the chapter appears to be all a ſtring of digreſſions. In a hiſtory of the *cruſades*, perhaps in a *full* hiſtory of the *empire* or of *Mahometaniſm*, Mr. Gibbon might allowably take this ample ſweep of particular narration. But in a hiſtory of the *decline* and *fall* of the empire, he is only adding digreſſion to digreſſion; and piling one mountain upon the head of another, that he may loſe himſelf in the clouds.

None

None of theſe accounts marks any ſymptom of decline, or ſhews any tendency of falling, in the empire. They all indeed unite to note the very reverſe. The empire, the extinction of which was threatened in the danger of the capital, is reſcued from every danger, and ſaved from every threat. The narrow dimenſions of the empire are enlarged. The loſt provinces are recovered, by the homagers of the empire. The internal power of it is augmented, by ſtrong colonies of foreigners. And the two great kingdoms of the Mahometans, that had ſucceſſively menaced the deſtruction of it, are now humbled by the armies of its ſpirited auxiliaries from the Weſt. Yet all this is related, with a circumſtantial minuteneſs of narrative, and with digreſſional diſſertations concerning the juſtice of the expedition, its ſpiritual and temporal motives, the falſehood of one of the miracles in it, the extent and ſtrength of the kingdom erected in it at Jeruſalem, and its laws and cuſtoms; in a hiſtory, that profeſſes to give us *only* the *decline* and *fall* of the empire, and that promiſes to produce *merely* the *important* circumſtances of it. The decline of the empire is ſhewn—in the reſtoration of it. The fall is exhibited—in the enlargement. And the appearance behind the mirrour, is totally different from the figure before it.

Mr. Gibbon inquires into the juſtice of the cruſade. He urges, that the Chriſtians of the Weſt might equitably preſerve the endangered empire of Conſtantinople, and relieve their oppreſſed brethren of the eaſtern churches; 'but this ſalutary purpoſe might have been accompliſhed by a moderate ſuccour; and our calmer reaſon muſt diſclaim the innumerable hoſts and *remote operations*, which overwhelmed Aſia and depopulated Europe.' Their reſolution alſo to recover *Jeruſalem*, was a wild one, he adds: as 'Paleſtine could add nothing to the ſtrength and ſafety of the Latins, and fanaticiſm alone could pretend to juſtify the conqueſt of that diſtant and narrow province[1].' And he farther adds, that the Mahometans had as good a right to their conquered territory in the Eaſt, as the Chriſtians themſelves had to theirs in the Weſt; both being equally the reſult of conqueſt. With theſe arguments does Mr. Gibbon mean to condemn the cruſades. He who, at the eruption of the Saracens from the deſerts of Arabia, inſtitutes no inquiry into the juſtice of *their* proceedings, and throws no formal ſtain upon the honeſty of *their* arms; inſtitutes one of condemnation againſt the Chriſtians. But the cruſades may be juſtified, upon the plaineſt principles of honeſt policy.

A nation had burſt from the wilds of Tartary, had embraced the religion of Mahometaniſm, had in the courſe of a few years reduced all the European ſide of Aſia, and now menaced the immediate deſtruction of the empire. In theſe circumſtances of alarm and danger, well might the nations of the Weſt be apprehenſive for themſelves. They had recently ſeen their own folly in their own ſufferings;

---

[1] P. 9—11.

ings; when they had permitted the firſt flight of theſe Mahometan locuſts, to make the ſame ſettlements unreſiſted. The Saracens had then reduced Africa, to its weſtern frontier; had ſubdued Sicily and Spain; and had ravaged France and Italy. The Turks were the Saracens revived, with *their* religion, *their* enthuſiaſm, and *their* victoriouſneſs. And the ſame conſequences would be ſure to reſult, from the ſame inattention to their progreſs in the nations of the Weſt. Thus reflecting; and they could not but reflect in this manner, if they thought at all; they muſt naturally wiſh to prevent the re-invaſion of Europe, by diſpoſſeſſing theſe formidable Tartars of their nearer conqueſts in Aſia. The long line of coaſt, that ranges from the Euxine to Egypt, would be their object. And to beat back theſe fanatic ſavages into the inland countries, perhaps beyond the Euphrates, and perhaps into Tartary; would be their wiſh. They would thus think as HANNIBAL thought, and thus act as HANNIBAL acted, with the ſpreading conquerors of Rome. So indeed every man muſt act and think, who has diſcernment enough, to apprehend clearly the future from the paſt; and who has vigour enough, to reſolve upon preventing the evils by his reſolution, which he cannot but foreſee in his ſagacity. Even Mr. Gibbon objects not to the principle. He only makes exception to the numbers, with which it was purſued. But the exception is ſurely a very poor one, the petty effort of a mind, that *would* make exceptions though it *could* not object. The principle of HANNIBAL'S warfare, on this mode of reaſoning, was equally juſt and wiſe; *but* why ſhould he carry ſuch a large army with him, for the execution of his views? His 'ſalutary purpoſe' of keeping the Romans from Africa, by invading their own country of Italy; 'might have been accompliſhed by a 'moderate ſuccour' to the Gauls of Italy. 'And 'our calmer reaſon muſt diſclaim;' *not* indeed, as Mr. Gibbon diſclaims in the cruſaders, 'the remote 'operations' of Hannibal in Italy, becauſe the 'operations' there would be equally 'remote,' either with a large or with a moderate army; but 'the innumerable hoſts' of Africans and Spaniards, 'with which' he 'overwhelmed' the regions of Italy, 'and depopulated' thoſe of Carthage. So truly ridiculous does Mr. Gibbon's exception appear, when applied to an expedition, projected upon a ſimilar principle, and executed nearly in the ſame manner.

Yet the reſolution of wreſting *Paleſtine* out of the hands of the Mahometans, adds Mr. Gibbon, was very fanatic. It was not ſo in itſelf, as I have already ſhewn. And, if it was made ſo by the leaders or by accident, it was ſo made very uſefully. Thoſe elder brothers in fanaticiſm, the Saracens, who had become ſo truly formidable from the military genius of Mahometaniſm; and their younger brothers, the Turks, who had imbibed their ſpirit, and were treading in their ſteps; could only have been encountered by an equal principle of fanaticiſm or of religion, in the endangered kingdoms of the Weſt.

Nothing leſs than ſuch a ſtrong principle as this, which by the novelty, the grandeur, and the affectingneſs of its object, would ſtrike powerfully upon the ſoul, puſh with a vigorous fermentation through all the ſubſtance of its hopes and fears, and even rouſe them to an energy unfelt before; could poſſibly have done this. And the introduction of recovering Paleſtine from the Mahometans, and reſcuing the ſepulchre of our Saviour out of the polluting hands of the infidels; was certainly one of the happieſt ſtrokes of policy, or one of the luckieſt incidents of chance, that could come in aid of ſuch a rational policy. It became the active ſpirit, that vivified the whole maſs. In vain would the remote concerns of futurity have been held up, to the generality of the world. They would have heard, have been convinced, and ſtill ſlept over the danger. But when an object of their religion was exhibited along with it; when the ſepulchre of Him, in whom they all believed, and from whom they all hoped for ſalvation, was exhibited to them, as polluted by the hands of his and their enemies; and when to reſcue this was conſidered as an act of high religion, a glorious exertion of faith, and a deed of Chriſtian heroiſm; all were ſtruck, all were wrought upon. The wicked had ſtill their inward reverence, for all that was ſacred in their religion. This reverence was now touched in its tendereſt ſtring. It vibrated therefore very feelingly from the impulſe. And the heart, which would not be holy in order to gain heaven, and yet ſtill foſtered the vain hope of gaining heaven without holineſs; readily caught at this ſurer way of gaining it, by the eaſier mode of fighting for it. Nor was this deluſive kind of reaſoning peculiar to thoſe times. We ſee the ſame continually in our own; external deeds ſubſtituted for internal rectitude. But the good felt the impulſe much more powerfully. Their practice continually cheriſhed the vital flame in their heart. Their ſpirits were ready to kindle, at any offered incentive of religion. And Shakeſpeare has accordingly ſtated in an age of commencing proteſtantiſm, this motive for a cruſade in ſuch a manner; as is *felt* (we believe) by our own age, and was more felt probably in his;

————————therefore, friends,
As far as to the ſepulchre of Chriſt
(Whoſe ſoldiers now, under whoſe bleſſed croſs
We are impreſſed, and engaged to fight)
Forthwith a power of Engliſh ſhall we levy;
Whoſe arms were moulded in their mothers' wombs
To chaſe theſe pagans in thoſe holy fields,
Over whoſe acres walk'd thoſe bleſſed feet,
Which, fourteen hundred years ago, were nail'd
For our advantage, on the bitter croſs.

Yet Mr. Gibbon objects, that the Chriſtians had no more right to diſpoſſeſs the Turks of Paleſtine, than the Turks had to deprive them of their dominions in the Weſt; and that they fanatically ſuppoſed Paleſtine to be theirs, becauſe of their Saviour's ſufferings in it. So ſuppoſing, they were only thinking with a portion of that over-religiouſ-neſs or fanaticiſm, which was requiſite to the general undertaking. This was only a mark of the height, to which the neceſſary ſpring-tide of religion was riſen. Nor was there any injuſtice in it. The Turks had no right, and the Saracens had none; except what the ſword of conqueſt had given them. To this right of theirs, might with equal juſtice be oppoſed the right of a *new* conqueſt. But the only nation beſides, that claimed the country, the Romans, urged more equitably againſt it their long poſſeſſion, their recent loſs, and their preſent claim. On this footing ſtand all the national rights in the world. Take away this; and the world becomes one great ſcene of national ſcrambles, without right, or poſſibility of right, in any of the nations. And the Romans SOLICITED the aſſiſtance of their brother Chriſtians of the Weſt, for the preſervation of the empire and the recovery of its provinces. What then, but the rank and fœtid fanaticiſm of the Koran, can pretend to doubt the right of the Chriſtians, to aſſiſt the reduced empire, and to wreſt back its provinces from the plunderers?

On theſe ſolid and ſubſtantial grounds of juſtice, and with this ſtrong body of policy animated with that lively ſoul of religion; did the nations of the Weſt come gallantly forward to the cruſade. Their conduct forms a very wonderful object of curioſity, to the philoſopher, the politician, and the hiſtorian. The diſunited kingdoms of the late empire of the Weſt, that had been overwhelmed with a deluge of barbarians from Germany and the Baltick; that had however ſubdued this wild acceſſion of foreign ſoil, had incorporated it into its own ſubſtance, and had riſen at laſt the ſtronger and the more luxuriant from it; now united into a kind of looſe republick again, under the ſeeming ſovereignty of the eccleſiaſtical king of Rome too, and in order to relieve and reſtore the remaining half of the empire. They thus ſhewed an attention to that grand principle of modern policy, of which we feel the want in all the progreſs of the Roman arms, and which we vainly fancy to be the refinement of theſe latter days. They alſo carried their attention to a length, to which the poor and feeble policy of modern times has never been capable of going. And this extraordinary diſplay of policy, and this aſtoniſhing eruption of religion, unite to make one of the moſt ſingular epochas in the hiſtory of human nature; and ſerved, with wiſdom and with juſtice, to ſave the empire of Conſtantinople for ages, and to keep the Turks out of weſtern Europe for ever.

'If the reader will turn to the firſt ſcene of the 'Firſt Part of Henry the Fourth, he will ſee in 'the text of Shakeſpeare the natural feelings of 'enthuſiaſm; and in the notes of Dr. Johnſon, the 'workings of a bigotted though vigorous mind, 'greedy of every pretence to hate and perſecute 'thoſe who diſſent from his creed[1].' The reader has already turned to the text; let him now turn to the notes. 'The lawfulneſs and juſtice of the holy wars,' ſays Dr. Johnſon, 'have been much diſputed; but

---

[1] P. 9.

'perhaps there is a principle, on which the queſtion 'may be eaſily determined. If it be part of the 'religion of the Mahometans, to extirpate by the 'ſword all other religions; it is, by the law of ſelf-'defence, lawful for men of every other religion, 'and for Chriſtians among others, to make war 'upon the Mahometans, ſimply as Mahometans, 'as men obliged by their own principles to make 'war upon Chriſtians, and only lying in wait till 'opportunity ſhall promiſe them ſucceſs.' Are theſe then *all* 'the workings of a bigotted though vigo-'rous mind,' that we were to ſee here? Is this then *that* ſtriking evidence to which we were referred, for Johnſon being '*greedy* of *every* pretence, to '*hate* and *perſecute* thoſe who *diſſent from his creed?*' The charge recoils forcibly upon the bringer of it. And the *bigotry*, the *hatred*, and the *perſecution*, are beaten back in the face of the accuſer. Mr. Gibbon evidently *caught* at this opportunity of inſulting the *dead* lion, for the many triumphs which it had made in its life, over the proſtrated carcaſe of infidelity. He thus defeated his purpoſe by his eagerneſs. There is *not* much 'vigour,' in the ſhort paſſage. Nor is there *one* particle of 'bigotry,' of 'hatred,' or of 'perſecution,' in it. There is only one miſtake, in ſuppoſing it to be 'part of the 'religion of the Mahometans, to *extirpate* by the 'ſword all other religions.' This indeed was *actually* practiſed, on the *firſt* ground of their religion. 'Under the reign of Omar' the ſecond ſucceſſor of Mahomet, ſays Mr. Gibbon himſelf, 'the Jews of

'Chaibar were *tranſplanted* to Syria; and the caliph 'alleged the injunction of his dying maſter, that '*one* and *the true* religion ſhould be profeſſed in his 'native land of *Arabia*[1].' But the Mahometans *neceſſarily* refrained from practiſing it, in their other conqueſts. And Dr. Johnſon only produces the allegation as a *conditional* one, though Mr. Gibbon chooſes to conſider it as *poſitive*. '*If* it be part of 'the religion of the Mahometans,' he ſays, 'to extirpate,' &c. But let us change the word *extirpate* into *ſubdue*, and then the allegation may become *abſolute*, and the argument will be deciſive. '*As it is* part 'of the religion of the Mahometans,' Dr. Johnſon would then ſay, 'to *ſubdue* by the ſword all other religions; it is, by the law of ſelf defence, lawful for 'men of every other religion, and for Chriſtians among others, to make war upon Mahometans, 'ſimply as Mahometans, as men obliged by their 'own principles to make war upon Chriſtians, and 'only lying in wait till opportunity ſhall promiſe 'them ſucceſs.' And Mr. Gibbon himſelf allows us, 'that, in *peace* or *war*, they *aſſert* a *divine* and '*indefeaſible* claim of *univerſal empire*[2].' I thus vindicate the character and the reaſoning of Dr. Johnſon, from the abuſe of a writer, who, I know, at once hated and dreaded him in his life-time.

In all this hiſtory of the firſt cruſade, we ſee a ſtudied deſign to ſhade the glory of the Chriſtians, to place their failings and vices in the fulleſt point of light, and to break into the great order of narration with the view of leſſening their victories. We ſee all this particularly exemplified, in the hiſtory of the ſiege and battle of Antioch. We have firſt a general and rapid account of the ſiege; too general to catch the attention much, and too rapid to reſt upon it long. Inſtantly as this is ended, without pauſing one moment upon the greatneſs and importance, of winning ſuch a town after ſuch a reſiſtance; we ſee the Chriſtians within it, ſurrounded by a large army of Mahometans. The good-fortune of having entered the town, before the Mahometans came up to relieve it; is not touched upon. To have done ſo, would have betrayed ſome ſymptoms of remaining Chriſtianity in Mr. Gibbon's head. And he could not be capable of ſuch a *weakneſs*. But the deliverance of the Chriſtians, is as ſudden and ſhort as their danger. They 'ſallied,' out, and 'in a ſingle memorable day annihilated 'or diſperſed the hoſt of Turks and Arabians.' Mr. Gibbon then points at 'the human cauſes' of their victory. 'Their ſupernatural allies,' he ſays, 'I ſhall proceed to conſider' hereafter. He thus deprives us of the pleaſure, of dwelling upon this victorious battle of the Chriſtians. For he haſtens *back*, to tell us of their intemperance from plenty, of their diſtreſs from famine, of their viciouſneſs at the ſiege of the town, and during their blockade in it by the Mahometans. 'The Chriſtians were ſe-'duced,' he ſays, 'by *every* temptation that *nature* 'either prompts or *reprobates*[1];' when his own note to the paſſage ſhews only *one ſingle* incident, and that *not* of luſt which 'nature reprobates,' but of 'an 'archdeacon of royal birth—*playing at dice* with a 'Syrian concubine;' and when *this* ſerves to refute the infamous calumny in *that*. He then tells us of a pretended miracle, that inſpirited the Chriſtians; of their marching out to attack the Mahometans; and of another miracle being ſuppoſed to be ſeen by them, in their march. But, juſt as we expect ſome account of the charge, the battle, the victory, and its glorious conſequences; we are inſtantly turned off with one inquiry, into the reality of the firſt miracle, and with another into the ſtate of the Turks and Saracens, &c. &c. And thus artfully loſt in its effect upon the reader, by being broken into fragments, the battle being ſeparated from the victory, and the interval filled up with invectives againſt the conquerors; and thus diſgraced by falſehoods *more than Mahometan*, againſt theſe 'barbarians of the 'Weſt,' as he preſumes to call them[1]; the hiſtory muſt be ſpurned at with diſdain, by every friend to truth, to honeſty, and to Chriſtianity. Indeed in all the narrative of this chapter, we ſee the Mahometan ſo rampant in Mr. Gibbon; and the love of antichriſtian falſehoods in him, ſo much ſtronger than a regard to himſelf and a reverence for honour, thoſe two pillars of heaven and of hiſtory; that we cannot truſt his word for a moment, and we cannot but deſpiſe his ſpirit continually.

---

[1] Vol. v. p. 237.

[2] Vol. vi. p. 19.

---

[1] p. 50.

'The mother of Tancred was Emma, ſiſter of the

---

[1] P. 55.

'great Robert Guiſcard; his father, the Marquis 'Odo the Good. It is ſingular enough, that the 'family and country of ſo illuſtrious a perſon ſhould 'be unknown[1].' This is all a miſtake, I apprehend. Tancred was not *nephew* to Robert Guiſcard, and *ſon* to Odo. He was the *ſon* of Roger, Count of Apulia, *nephew* to Bohemond, Prince of Tarento, and grandſon to Robert Guiſcard. This a letter of Bohemond's own ſhews. Mr. Gibbon quotes it himſelf. There, he remarks, 'Tancred is 'ſtyled *filius*; of whom? certainly not of Roger, 'nor of Bohemond[2].' And on this account, and becauſe Godfrey of Bouillon and Hugh are called *brothers* in it, *ſworn-brothers*, I ſuppoſe; he calls it 'a very doubtful letter.' But we have another from Bohemond to his brother Roger. 'I ſuppoſe you,' it ſays from Antioch, 'to have underſtood by the 'letters of *your ſonne* Tancred,' &c.; 'I aſſure you 'much of the valour of *your ſonne* Tancred[3].' This ſettles at once the unknown 'family and country' of Tancred's paternal anceſtors. And Tancred is accordingly called the *nephew* of Bohemond, 'Tan-'credus nepos Boamundi;' by a very reſpectable hiſtorian of the time[4].

'At the ſiege of Antioch,' ſays Mr. Gibbon, 'Phirouz, a Syrian renegado, had acquired the fa-'vour of the Emir and the command of three

---

[1] p. 25. [2] p. 43. [3] Knolles, 19.

[4] William of Malmeſbury, p. 79, edit. 1596. So alſo in fol. 85 concerning him and Bohemond, 'haud pudendus avunculo 'nepos.'

‘ towers.—A ſecret correſpondence, for *their mutual* ‘ *intereſt*, was ſoon eſtabliſhed between Phirouz and ‘ the prince of Tarento; and Bohemond declared ‘ in the council of the chiefs, that he could deliver ‘ the city into their hands. But he claimed the ſovereignty of Antioch, *as the reward of his ſervice*; and the propoſal, which had been rejected by the ‘ *envy*, was *at length* extorted from the *diſtreſs*, of his ‘ equals.’ The town was taken. ‘ But the citadel ‘ ſtill refuſed to ſurrender; and the victors themſelves were *ſpeedily* encompaſſed and beſieged’ by the Turks[1]. Here are ſeveral miſtakes, which a letter of the time deciſively corrects. ‘ King Caſſianus,’ ſays Bohemond himſelf concerning the Turkiſh governor of Antioch, ‘ had *required a time* ‘ *of truce*,’ a circumſtance totally omitted by Mr. Gibbon; ‘ *during which our ſoldiers had free recourſe into the citie without danger*,’ a ſtriking feature in the complexion of theſe cruſades, that is equally unnoticed by Mr. Gibbon; ‘ untill that by the death of ‘ Vollo a Frenchman, ſlaine by the enemie, the ‘ truce was broken. But, whilſt it yet ſeemed an ‘ hard matter to winne the citie, one *Pyrrhus*, a ‘ citizen of Antioch, *of great authority*, and *much* ‘ *devoted unto mee*, had conference with me concerning the yeelding up of the citie; yet *upon condition*, that the *government thereof ſhould be committed* ‘ *to me*, in whom *he had repoſed an eſpeciall truſt*. ‘ I conferred of the whole matter, with the princes ‘ and great commanders of the armie; and *eaſily*

---

[1] P. 48.

'obtained, that the government of the citie was by 'their generall conſent allotted unto me. So our 'armie, entering by a gate opened by Pyrrhus, tooke 'the citie. *Within a few daies after*, the towne A-'retum was by us aſſaulted, but not without ſome 'loſſe and danger to our perſon, by reaſon of a 'wound I there received[1].' Here we ſee, that the correſpondence between Bohemond and Pyrrhus began, in the extraordinary intercourſe permitted by the truce, and then Pyrrhus had ſhewn himſelf *much devoted* to Bohemond; that Bohemond did not carry it on for his *private* intereſt; that Pyrrhus made it an expreſs ſtipulation of his opening the gates to the Chriſtians, Bohemond ſhould have the government of it afterwards; that he did this, uninfluenced by Bohemond, and purely conſidering his own intereſt, he being *a citizen of great authority*, and wanting to retain it under a governor, to whom he was *much devoted*, and in whom *he repoſed an eſpecial truſt*; that Bohemond mentioned the propoſal and the ſtipulation to the other generals, and the latter was *not* 'rejected by their envy,' and 'at 'length extorted from their diſtreſs,' but was 'eaſi-'ly obtained' from them; and that, *after* taking the town and *before* the coming up of the Turks, *the town of Aretum was attacked*, and *Bohemond was wounded in the aſſault*. Such a number of miſtakes have we here, in this ſhort paſſage!

'I have been urged to anticipate *on* the ſtory of 'the cruſades,' p. 29; 'their portable treaſures

---

[1] Knolles, 19.

'*was*,' p. 29; 'had almoſt reached the firſt *term* 'of his pilgrimage,' p. 30.—'In ſome oriental tale 'I have read the fable of a ſhepherd, who was 'ruined by the accompliſhment of his own wiſhes: '—ſuch was the fortune, or at leaſt the apprehen'ſion, of the Greek emperor[1].' This is the ſtyle of a diſſertation, and not of a hiſtory. But Mr. Gibbon is perpetually confounding the two ideas. And his whole hiſtory hitherto is little more, than one extenſive and amplified diſſertation.—'He was 'himſelf inveſted,' ſays Mr. Gibbon in his very frequent obſcurity, 'with that ducal title, which 'has been improperly transferred to his lordſhip of 'Bouillon in the Ardennes,' p. 22; 'they overran '—the hills and ſea-coaſt of Cilicia, from Cogni to 'the Syrian gates,' p. 449; &c. &c.

Abulpharagius is again 'the Jacobite primate,' p. 53; when he was only a phyſician among the Jacobite Chriſtians.—In his firſt volume Mr. Gibbon, from the littleneſs of his ſpite againſt the Jews, called them 'the moſt deſpiſed' portion of the Aſſyrian ſlaves; when he had no authority but his ſpite, for ſaying they were deſpiſed at all. In the ſame petty malice of infidelity he ſays here, that Jeruſalem had 'derived *ſome* reputation from its ſieges[2];' when its ſieges are the moſt memorable in hiſtory. —Conrad's wife 'confeſſed the manifold proſtitu'tions, to which ſhe had been expoſed by a huſ'band, regardleſs of her honour and his own.' So ſays the text p. 4. 'Yet it ſhould ſeem,' adds the note, 'that the wretched woman was *tempted by* '*the prieſts*, to relate or ſubſcribe ſome infamous 'ſtories of herſelf and her huſband.' *It ſhould ſeem* then, that the *charge* in the *text* is *not true*, or at leaſt the *aſſertion* in it is *doubtful.*

---

[1] p. 32.

[2] p. 57.

'Their ſiege,' ſays Mr. Gibbon, p. 59, concerning the cruſaders before Jeruſalem, 'was more reaſonably directed againſt the *northern* and *weſtern* 'ſides of the city. Godfrey of Bouillon erected his 'ſtandard on the firſt ſwell of Mount Calvary,' which is on the north-weſt[1]; 'to the *left*,' which is therefore to the *eaſt*, 'as far as St. Stephen's gate,' which lies about the *middle* of the *eaſtern* ſide[2], 'the line of attack was continued by Tancred and 'the two Roberts; and Count Raymond eſtabliſhed his quarters from the citadel,' which was (as we ſhall ſhew immediately) on the *ſouth-weſt*, 'to 'the foot of Mount Sion, which was no longer in'cluded within the precincts of the city,' was not *all*, but was *in part*, even in *great* part, and lay to the *ſouth* of Calvary[3]. What a labyrinth of confuſion have we here! The attack is directed only againſt the *northern* and *weſtern* ſides. Godfrey accordingly encamps on the *north-weſtern*. But then the attack is diverted by Mr. Gibbon's miſtake, from the *right* to the *left*, and from the *weſtern* to the *eaſtern* ſide. Yet we inſtantly find, that this *eaſtern* was meant for the *weſtern*; as the line of attack is continued round by the *ſouth-weſt*, to the

---

[1] See Pococke, 11. Part 1. 7. Plan.

[2] Pococke.

[3] Pococke.

ſouth. Where indeed 'the citadel' lies, is not explained *here* by Mr. Gibbon. But it is *hereafter. Two pages afterward* he makes it to be the *Piſan Caſtle,* which was a little to the north of the ſouth-weſtern angle[1]. And as we can know the true hiſtory of reducing Antioch and Jeruſalem, not from Mr. Gibbon, but only from Knolles; ſo we may obſerve the accuracy of Knolles contraſted with the confuſedneſs of Mr. Gibbon, in this very paſſage. 'The Chriſtians,' *he* ſays, 'with their armies aproching the citie, encamped before it on the '*north*; for that, towards the *eaſt* and *ſouth,* it was 'not well to be beſieged, by reaſon of the broken 'rocks and mountaines. Next unto the citie lay 'Godfrey the duke, with the Germanes and Loranois; *neere unto him lay the Earle of Flanders and 'Robert the Norman*; before the *weſt* gate lay Tancred and the Earle of Thoulouſe[2].'

At this ſiege, 'the ſcanty *ſprings* and haſty torrents were *dry* in the ſummer ſeaſon; nor was the 'thirſt of the beſiegers relieved, *as in the city,* by 'the artificial ſupply of ciſterns and aqueducts[3].' This is not true. A letter of the time, as given us by Knolles, ſhews it not to be ſo. 'After long travell,' ſays the writer, 'having firſt taken certaine townes, 'we came to Jeruſalem; which citie is environed 'with high hills, without rivers or fountaines, *excepting onely that of Solomon's,* and that *a verie little one.*

---

[1] Pococke.

[2] Knolles, p. 22.

[3] p. 59.

'In it are many ceſterns, wherein water is kept, 'both in the citie and the countrey thereabout[1].'

In ſtorming Jeruſalem, ſays Mr. Gibbon, ever eager to lay load upon the cruſaders, 'a bloody ſa'crifice was offered by his miſtaken votaries, to 'the God of the Chriſtians—; they indulged them'ſelves *three days* in a promiſcuous maſſacre.' A note adds, that 'the *Latins*—are not *aſhamed* of *the* 'maſſacre;' but pretends not to point out any of them. 'After ſeventy thouſand Moſlems had been 'put to the ſword,' &c. 'Tancred alone betrayed 'ſome ſentiments of compaſſion.' And 'the ſelfiſh 'lenity of Raymond—granted a capitulation and 'ſafe conduct, to the garriſon of the citadel.' Note adds, that *this* was named 'Caſtellum Piſanum,' and 'the Tower of David[2].' It was, as I have noticed before, near the ſouth-weſtern angle of the city; and conſequently upon Mount Sion, the ſeat of David's city. But I have produced this paſſage, in order to collate it with that original letter of the time, which I have cited in part before. 'In the 'aſſault of the citie,' ſays *Godfrey of Bouillon* himſelf, 'I firſt gained that part of the wall that fell 'to my *lot* to aſſaile, and commanded Baldwin to 'enter the citie; who, having ſlain certaine com'panies of the enemies, broke open one of the 'gates for the Chriſtians to enter. Raymond had 'the citie of David, with much rich ſpoile, yeelded 'unto him. But, when we came unto the temple 'of Solomon, there we had a great conflict, with

---

[1] Knolles, 24.

[2] p. 60—61.

'ſo great ſlaughter of the enemie, that our men 'ſtood in blood above the ancles; the night ap'proching, we could not take the upper part of 'the temple, which the next day was yeelded, the 'Turks pitifully crying out for mercie: and ſo the 'citie of Jeruſalem was by us taken the fifteenth of 'July——: beſides this, the princes with one con'ſent ſaluted me (againſt my will) King of Jeru'ſalem.' This is the moſt authentic account of the ſtorm of Jeruſalem, that the nature of hiſtory can poſſibly furniſh; becauſe it is a cotemporary one, given by an eye-witneſs, and drawn up by the grand actor and conductor of the whole. Yet how aſtoniſhingly does it differ from Mr. Gibbon's! The aſſerted 'maſſacre of three days,' of which 'the 'Latins' are ſaid to be 'not aſhamed,' is ſhewn to be abſolutely falſe by the very general of the Latins. The ſtorm of Jeruſalem was like many other ſtorms of cities, a progreſſive ſcene of fighting and blood through the ſtreets, up to the level of Mount Moriah. *There* had ſtood the temple of Solomon. *There* now ſtood another temple, the preſent moſque, with 'colonades' to it, 'which have a 'grand appearance, and are of *very* good *Corin'thian* architecture[1].' It was therefore a Chriſtian church before, built in the time of the Romans; and had been turned into a moſque, as it is now turned again. To this ground, as to the moſt retired and defenſible part of the whole town, and into this moſque upon it, had many of the Turks retreated. Here they were attacked by the victorious Chriſtians. Inſtantly there was 'a great 'conflict.' This was carried on 'with ſo great a 'ſlaughter of the enemie, that' the aſſailants 'ſtood 'in blood above the ancles.' This is a ſtroke moſt formidably picturesque, to mark the ſlaughter of the 'conflict.' But the Turks, though driven from the interiour of the temple, ſtill maintained themſelves upon the roof of it, and beat off the Chriſtians. 'The night approching,' they 'could not 'take the upper part of the temple.' They deſiſted from their attempts, for the night. But 'the next day' they were preparing to renew them. The Turks, ſeeing this, 'pitifully cried out for mercie.' Mercy was promiſed them. The roof 'was 'yeelded' up. 'And ſo the citie of Jeruſalem 'was by them taken,' without any more bloodſhed. Such is the *certain* account of this ſtorm! Where then is the horrible 'maſſacre' of 'three 'days?' There was no maſſacre at all. There was even no blood-ſhed, except ſuch as is always made in a ſtorm, *while the oppoſition laſts.* Nor was *this* 'for three days.' It was for one only. And the very next morning, when the Turks on the roof of the temple cried out for quarter, it was granted them. What then ſhall we ſay, to the bold and daring falſhood in Mr. Gibbon? We *hope* he was deceived by, as he actually refers us to, 'Elmacin (Hiſt. Saracen. p. 363), Abulpharagius (Dynaſt. p. 243), and M. de Guignes (tom. 'II. p. II. p. 99) from Aboulmahaſen.' But at the beſt, and ſuppoſing him *not* to have falſified *their* reports; yet he has certainly been very *credulous*, in leaning upon ſuch *ſecondary* authorities, when he had ſuch a *primary* one at hand. And his credulity, every one muſt obſerve, is *never* exerted *except* on the *anti-chriſtian* ſide. Nor is this all his miſtake, in this deſcription of the ſtorm. He choſe again to confound the natural courſe of the narration, which is all regularly given in Knolles[1], in order, no doubt, to ſerve the ſame purpoſe as before, of diſtorting the facts, breaking their unity, and diminiſhing their force. He thus omits all mention whatever, of the ſtand at the temple or moſque on Mount Moriah, of the bloody conflict held in it, and of the mercy ſhewn to thoſe upon the roof of it. This grand and memorable incident in the ſtorm, did not ſuit with his views of writing hiſtory. It would have precluded his ' maſſacre of ' three days.' It was therefore ſuppreſſed. Yet he ſays, immediately previous to the paſſages above, that ' the ſpoils of *the great moſch*, ſeventy lamps ' and maſſy vaſes of gold and ſilver, rewarded the ' diligence—of Tancred.' And he, who notices the ſpoils of the temple, and takes no notice of the ſharp conflict at it, muſt have wilfully ſuppreſſed the latter. But Raymond, he ſays *finally*, ' granted ' a capitulation and ſafe conduct to the garriſon of ' the citadel.' This is evidently ſaid from its final poſition, in order to ſingle him out as one, who ſhewed kindneſs amid the bloody ſpirit of his maſſacreing companions. Yet the fact is, that it happened in the *very beginning* of the ſtorm. One of the gates, ſays Godfrey, was ‘ broke open—for the Chriſtians ‘ to enter:’ Raymond had ‘ *the citie of David,*’ that is, all that large part of it, the ground of which was within the walls, ‘ with much rich ſpoile, *yeelded* ‘ unto him;’ but, when we ‘ came to the temple ‘ of Solomon,’ &c. *That* was not ſtormed, but *yeelded* to him; juſt as the upper part of the temple was afterwards to the reſt. And Mr. Gibbon either directly *precludes* the *yielding* of the latter, and the *mercy* ſhewn at it, by declaring that, ‘ of theſe ‘ ſavage heroes of the croſs, Tancred *alone* betrayed ‘ ſome ſentiments of compaſſion,’ as Raymond did of ‘ ſelfiſh lenity;’ or elſe alludes to the mercy at the temple, in what he thus ſays of Tancred, and in what he alſo hints of ‘ the ſpoils of the great ‘ moſch—*diſplaying the generoſity* of Tancred;’ and ſo glances obſcurely, at what he *fully knew* and *choſe not to reveal.* He fully knew all, no doubt. Yet he choſe not to reveal it. He *actually* has *falſified* the alleged evidence of the Latins. And, on the whole, he appears in ſuch a light upon the preſent occaſion, as muſt blaſt his hiſtorical credit with the critical world, and annihilate his perſonal reputation with the Chriſtian, for ever.

---

[1] Pococke, 14.

---

[1] p. 23.

‘ The expulſion of the Greeks and Syrians’ from the holy ſepulchre at Jeruſalem, ‘ was juſtified by ‘ the reproach of hereſy and ſchiſm (Renaudot, ‘ Hiſt. Patriarch. Alex. p. 479)[1].’ We have ſeen Mr. Gibbon before, making very free with the authority of this very Renaudot; and even fixing ſpecial and marked words upon him, that he never uſed. We ſee ſomething like this literary legerdemain, exerciſed here. The 'Greeks and Syrians' of Mr. Gibbon, are *neither* in Renaudot. They are merely *the Jacobite Chriſtians* of *Egypt*. 'Mirum nemini eſſe debet, eâ clade tantopere perculſos Mahomedanos fuiſſe, qui urbem celebrem ſanctitate, et ad quam Chriſtiani ex toto orbe confluerent, ereptam ſibi deplorabant. Sed non minor fuit *Jacobitarum Ægyptiorum* dolor—. Inde factum eſt,' ſays an author quoted by him 'ut nos Chriſtiani *Jacobitæ Coptitæ* non ampliús peregrinationis religioſæ ad eam urbem inſtituendæ facultatem habeamus.' But Mr. Gibbon has changed his *Copts* into *Greeks and Syrians*, and multiplied his *Jacobites* into *Neſtorians*, *Jacobites*, and *Melchites*. 'Every reader converſant with the hiſtory of the cruſades,' ſays Mr. Gibbon himſelf upon another occaſion, 'will underſtand by the 'peuple des *Suriens*, the *Oriental Chriſtians*, *Melchites*, *Jacobites*, or *Neſtorians*' (p. 70). Yet, to make it more full, Mr. Gibbon has added the *Greeks* to the *Syrians*. And, all the while, his author ſpeaks only of *Egyptians*. This is another inſtance of the *foul play*, which Mr. Gibbon practiſes with his references; and the point, in juſtice to the publick, cannot be too frequently proved to the reader.

---

[1] p. 63.

'William of Malmſbury (who wrote about the 'year 1130) has inſerted in his hiſtory (l. iv. p. '130—154) a narrative of the firſt cruſade: but

'I wiſh that, inſtead of liſtening to the tenue 'murmur which had paſſed the Britiſh ocean (p. '143), he had confined himſelf to the number of 'families, and adventures of his countrymen[1].' This is a very unjuſt account of Malmſbury's narrative. The latter contains much and uſeful matter in it. Nor has the former forgotten in this and other parts of his hiſtory, to give us intimations concerning the particular cruſaders of England, their 'families,' and their 'adventures.' *Edgar Atheling*, he ſays 'ſubſequenti tempore cum *Roberto Godwino*, 'milite audaciſſimo, Jeroſolymam pertendit.' The Turks, he adds, *then* beſieged King Baldwin at Rama, who broke through the hoſt of beſiegers, principally by the gallantry of Robert, 'evaginato 'gladio dextrâ lævâque Turcos cædentis. Sed 'cúm, ſucceſſu ipſo truculentior, alacritate nimiâ 'procurreret, enſis manu excidit; ad quem recolligendum cum ſe inclinaſſet, omnium incurſu op'preſſus, vinculis palmas dedit. Inde Babyloniam '(ut aiunt) ductus, cúm Chriſtum abnegare nollet, 'in medio foro ad ſignum poſitus, et ſagittis terebratus, martyrium conſecravit. Edgarus amiſſo 'milite regreſſus, multaque beneficia ab imperatoribus Græcorum et Alemannorum adeptus '(quippe qui etiam eum retinere pro generis amplitudine tentaſſent), omnia pro natalis ſoli deſiderio ſprevit[2].' But he ſpeaks again of this Robert, in his hiſtory of the cruſades. Baldwin, he ſays, 'quinque militibus comitatus, in montana re-

---

[1] p. 39.

[2] fol. 58.

'pendo inſidiantes eluſit: militum unus fuit Ro-'bertus Anglus, ut ſuperius dixi; cæteros notitiæ 'noſtræ fama tam longinqua occuluit[1].' He alſo mentions Odo, Biſhop of Baieux and Earl of Kent, as one of the companions of his nephew Robert, Duke of Normandy. He went with him to Jeruſalem and died at Antioch. 'Jeroſolymitanam 'viam ingreſſus, *Antiochiæ* in *obſidione Chriſtiano-'rum* finem habuit[2].' And he hints at a *large* body of the Engliſh going with Duke Robert: 'Ro-'bertus Normannorum Comes—habuit ſocios Ro-'bertum Flandrenſem, Stephanum Bleſenſem,' &c.: 'parebant eis *Angli*, et Normanni,' &c.[3]. In his narration too, he ſays ſome of the cruſaders marched through Theſſaly and Thrace to Conſtantinople, but that many of the common men died of want and diſeaſe by the way, and 'multi in *vado*, quod 'pro rapiditate *diaboli* dicitur, intercepti[4].' At the ſiege of Nice, 'exanimatorum cadavera Turci un-'cis ferreis innumerûm trahebant, ludibrio noſtro-'rum *excarnificanda*, vel *ablatis veſtibus* dejicienda.' On the ſurrender of Nice, the emperour 'juſſit—'diſtribui argentum et aurum optimatibus, nummos 'æreos inferioribus.' At the ſiege of Antioch 'om-'nes pariter proceres *ſacramento fecere*, obſidioni *non* 'ponendas ferias *quoad* vel vi vel ingenio prendere-'tur civitas.' But the Turks, putting many of the citizens of Antioch to the ſword, were 'baliſtis et 'petrariis *capita interemptorum* in caſtra Francorum 'emittentes.' A famine came on among the be-

---

[1] fol. 84. [2] fol. 63. [3] fol. 75. [4] fol. 76.

ſiegers.

ſiegers. ‘ Nondum ſurgentibus in altam ſegetem ‘ culmis, quidam *ſiliquas fabarum* nondum adultarum ‘ pro ſummis deliciis amplecterentur; alii *carnes* ‘ *jumentorum*, alii *coria* aquis mollita, quidam *carduos* parum coctos per abraſas fauces utero demittebant; quidam vel *mures*, vel *talium quid deliciarum*, poſcentibus aliis venundabant, et eſurire ‘ ſuſtinebat pro lato jejunus venditor auro; nec defuerunt qui *cadavera cadaveribus infarcirent*, *humanis paſti carnibus*, longé tamen et in montibus, ne ‘ nidore carnis aduſtæ cæteri offenderentur; plures, ‘ ſpe reperiendæ alimoniæ, ignotis vagabantur ſemitis, et a latrunculis viarum gnaris trucidabantur.’ Yet with a ſpirit of reſolution, which does high honour to the leaders and to the men; and, to paſs over which, Mr. Gibbon ſuppreſſes all theſe ſtriking circumſtances of the famine, a famine ſo uncommon in an un-ſurrounded camp of beſiegers; the Chriſtians perſiſted in ſpite of all, and took the town. In taking it ‘ Franci per funeas ſcalas nocte intempeſtâ in murum evecti, *vexilloque Boamundi*, *quod* ‘ *vermiculatum erat*, *ventis in faſtigio turris expoſito*, ‘ ſignum Chriſtianum lætis fragoribus ingeminant, ‘ *Deus vult*, *Deus vult*; Turci experrecti, et ſoporis penuria inertes, fugam per angiportus invadunt.’ The Turkiſh army comes, and ſurrounds them in the town. Diſtreſs enſues in it. ‘ Quapropter, *triduano* prius *cum letaniis* exacto *jejunio*, ‘ legatus *Petrus heremita* mittitur ad Turcos.’ He offers them the alternative, either to move away from before the town, and return into Perſia, or agree to fight them the next morning; 'ſortem per *duos* vel '*quatuor* vel *octo* experiantur, ne periculum ad to'tum vergat exercitum.' This ſingular, humane, and wiſe propoſal, which recalls to our minds an image of the earlieſt times of the Romans, the Turkiſh Sultan received in this ſtriking manner; without anſwering, '*ſcacchis ludens*, et *dentibus infrendens*, 'inanem dimiſit.' The Chriſtians then prepared to attack the Turks, the next day. But not the leaſt notice is taken of the holy lance, ſo much dwelt upon by Mr. Gibbon, and even noticed by Florence of Worceſter, a writer cotemporary with Malmeſbury [1]. Yet the appearance of St. George, and of *St. Demetrius* (inſtead of St. Theodore and St. Maurice), is noticed by Malmeſbury though unnoticed by Florence, and is even affirmed to be true. The order, in which the Chriſtians marched out of the town, is particularly told. Even one incident of the battle is noticed, to the honour of two Engliſhmen. Robert, eldeſt ſon to the Conqueror; 'victoriam pulchrâ experientiâ nobilitavit. Nam cùm 'Turci —, ſubitò terrefacti, fugæ ſe dediſſent, noſ'trique palantes vehementer impeterent; Corba'nach Dux,' the commander of the Turks, 'ge'nuinæ virtutis memor, retento equo ſuos inclina'vit, famulos ignavos et annoſarum victoriarum 'oblitos vocans, ut victores quondam orientis pa'terentur ſe ab advenâ et *pene inermi* populo finibus 'excludi. Quo clamore multi reſumentes ani'mum, Francos converſi urgere et propiores cæde-

---

[1] p. 467. Edit. 1592.

'recœpere; Corbanach ſuos animante et hoſtes fe'riente, ut imperatoris et militis officium probé ex'equeretur. Tum veró *Normannus Comes*, et *Phi'lippus clericus filius Rogerii Comitis de Monte Gome'rico*, et Warinus de Taneo caſtello Cenoman'nico, mutuâ vivacitate ſe invicem hortati, qui ſi'mulatâ anté fugâ cedebant convertunt cornipedes, 'et *quiſque ſuum comparem inceſſens dejiciunt.* Ibi 'Corbanach, quámvis Comitem cognoſceret, ſoló 'tamen corpore menſus;' Robert being (as Malmeſbury ſays before) of a ſmall ſtature, 'ſimul et fu'gere inglorium arbitratus, *audaciam congreſſûs morte 'propinquâ luit* vitali ſtatim ſpiritu privatus. Cujus 'nece viſâ, Turci, qui jam gloriabundi *ululabant*, 'ſpe recenti exinaniti fugam iterârunt. In eo tu'multu Warinus cecidit, *Robertus cum Philippo 'palmam retulit. Philippus* hâc militiâ præcluus '[præclarus], *ſed Jeroſolymis* (ut fertur) *bono fine 'functus*; præter exercitium equeſtre *literis clarus*[a].' This very extraordinary fact, the killing of the Turkiſh general with Robert's own hand, is wholly unnoticed by Mr. Gibbon. Yet he wiſhes Malmeſbury had given us ſome accounts, of the 'adventures' of our countrymen. And though he *has* given us ſome, Mr. Gibbon omits them all; either ignorant of their exiſtence, or unwilling to dwell upon them. The Chriſtians thus defeating the Turks, 'reverſi veró in predam, tanta in illo'rum caſtris reperiunt, quæ cujuſlibet avariſſimi 'exercitûs ſatietatem poſſent vel temperare vel ex'tinguere.'

---

[a] Fol. 86.

'tinguere.' Yet all theſe circumſtances are omitted by Mr. Gibbon.

The Chriſtians now advance by Tripolis, Berithus, Tyre, Sidon, Accaron, Caipha, and Cæſarea; there leave the ſea-coaſt to the right; and penetrate through Ramula to Jeruſalem. But here let me ſubjoin a circumſtance, that is omitted equally by Mr. Gibbon and by Malmeſbury, but is peculiarly characteriſtick of the ſpirit of theſe cruſaders.—'Marching from Ruma,' ſays Knolles, 'and drawing neere to Jeruſalem, they in the *vantgard* of 'the armie, *upon the firſt deſcrying of the holy citie*, 'gave for joy *divers great ſhouts and outcrys*, which 'with *the like applauſe* of *the whole armie*, was ſo '*doubled* and *redoubled*, as if therewith they would 'have *rent the verie mountaines* and *pearced the higheſt heavens*. There might a man have ſeene the 'devout paſſions of theſe moſt worthie and zealous 'Chriſtians, uttered in right divers manners: ſome 'with *their eies and hands caſt up towards heaven*, 'called aloud *upon the name and helpe of Chriſt Jeſus*; 'ſome, *proſtrat upon their faces, kiſſed the ground*, 'as *that whereon the Redeemer of the world ſometime 'walked*; others *joyfully ſaluted thoſe holy places*, 'which they had heard ſo much of and then firſt 'beheld: in briefe, *everie man* in *ſome* ſort *expreſſed 'the joy he had conceived* of the *ſight* of the Holy 'Citie, as the end of their long travell[1].' This paſſage carries ſuch a lively affectingneſs with it; that I well remember the impreſſion which it made upon my mind, when I *laſt* read it, and nearly *half a century ago*. And ſurely ſuch circumſtances as theſe ſhould be caught at with eagerneſs, by every hiſtory, by the *philoſophy* of hiſtory particularly, if this philoſophy means any thing beyond the pettineſs of oratorical parade, or the monſtrouſneſs of infidel credulity; as what peculiarly catch the manners of the moment while they are riſing, and reflect them back in all their vivacity and vividneſs to poſterity. In ſo ſtriking a way did the cruſaders act at the firſt view of Jeruſalem. They beſiege it. 'Nor was the thirſt of the *beſiegers* relieved,' ſays Mr. Gibbon; 'nor were there any trees for the 'uſes of ſhade;' but, as Malmeſbury, with a more judicious appoſiteneſs to the months of *June* and *July*, obſerves, 'nec quiſquam ſibi *obſeſſor* verebatur 'in cibatu vel in *potu*, quód meſſes in agris, uvæ 'in vineis, maturaverant; ſola jumentorum cura 'erat miſerabilis, quæ pro qualitate loci et tem'poris nullo ſuſtentabantur irriguo.' The commanders take their poſts. 'Raimundus veró *turris* '*Davidicæ* impiger aſſiſtebat: hæc *ad occaſum ſolis* 'urbem muniens, ad medium feré tabulatum qua'dratorum lapidum *plumbo infuſo compaginata*, om'nem metum obſidentium paucis intus defendenti'bus repellit.' The beſiegers however aſſaulted the town; not, as Mr. Gibbon ſays, 'in the fanatic 'hope of battering down the walls without engines, 'and of ſcaling them without ladders[1];' but 'for'tunam *ſcalis erectis* tentarunt, in reſiſtentes *volaticas*

---

[1] Knolles, p. 21.

---

[1] P. 59

'*moliti ſagittas.*' They were beaten off, not though, as Mr. Gibbon again ſays, 'by dint of *brutal force* 'they *burſt* the firſt barrier;' but 'quia erant *ſcalæ* 'paucæ, et aſcendentibus damnoſæ.' They then made two moveable turrets, one 'quod noſtri 'Suem, veteres Vineam vocant.' This he deſcribes, and adds, 'protegit in ſe ſubſidentes, qui, quaſi 'more ſuis, ad murorum ſuffodienda penetrant fun- 'damenta.' The other, 'in modum ædificiorum 'facta, *Berefreid* appellant[*], quod faſtigium muro- 'rum æquaret.' The aſſault begins. This is de- ſcribed by Malmeſbury, with a particularity and ſpirit that are very engaging, and that we in vain look for in Mr. Gibbon. *This* author reſerves *his* particularity for the *vices* of the *Chriſtians*, and *his* ſpirit for the *victories* of the *Mahometans*. The aſ- ſault continued one whole day, without effect. The next morning it was renewed, with more ſucceſs. Malmeſbury is ſtill particular and ſpirited. He ſets cauſes and effects, plain before our eyes. The Chriſ- tians under Godfrey and the two Roberts, gain the wall and enter the city. Raymund learns the fact, from hearing the clamour of the enemy, and ſeeing them throw themſelves headlong over the walls. He enters the town. 'Quingentos quoque *Æthiopas*, 'qui, in *arcem David* refugi, claves portarum, pol-

---

[*] A falſe reading for *B lfrid*, ſee Du Freſne's Gloſſary, Bene- dictine edition; our preſent *belfrey* for a church-ſteeple, and the French *belfrey* for a ſteeple and a turret; a name, not communi- cated from the turret to the ſteeple, as Dr. Johnſon ſuppoſes, but, as the former half of the name, and the previous uſe of *bells*, concur to ſhew, derived from the ſteeple to the turret.

'licitâ membrorum impunitate, tradiderant, ſpecta-'to præſentis pacis commodo incolumes Aſcalonem 'dimiſit.' *Then*, ſays Malmeſbury, but not with ſtrict propriety, as we have ſeen before, and ſhall inſtantly ſee here again, the Turks had no place of refuge, 'nec ullum erat *tunc* Turcis refugium; ita 'et ſupplices et *rebelles*,' a word that ſhews the oppoſition to have ſtill continued, 'inſatiabilis vic-'torum ira conſumebat.' Ten thouſand took refuge in the temple of Solomon, and were ſlain there; 'decem millia—interfecta.' *Then*, 'poſt hæc,' the dead bodies were collected and *burned*. This took up the army two or three days, after the grand day of the ſtorm. 'Ita *cæde infidelium expiatâ urbe*, ſe-'pulchrum Domini, quod tamdiu deſideraverant, 'pro quo tot labores tulerant, ſupplicibus cordibus 'et corporibus petierunt.' Yet, adds Malmeſbury, concerning the day of ſtorming the town, and the days of burning the dead, 'illud inſigne continentiæ 'in omnibus optimatibus exemplum fuit; quód 'nec *eo die*, nec *conſequentibus*, quiſquam reſpectu 'prædæ avocavit animum, quin cæptum perſeque-'rentur, triumphum.' There was only *one* exception. It was made by Tancred, the very hero of Mr. Gibbon's hiſtory, and praiſed by him for his 'generoſity' on this very occaſion. 'Solus Tan-'credus, intempeſtivâ cupidine occupatus, quædam 'precioſiſſima de templo Salomonis extulit; ſed 'poſtmodum ſuâ conſcientiâ et aliorum conventus '[convictus] colloquio, vel eadem vel appreciata 'loco reſtituit.' And this ſuſpenſion of all the ſtrong feelings of avarice, for *ſeveral* days; a victorious army abſtaining from touching the vaſt booty under their hands, in the very moments of rapine; and continuing calmly and ſteadily to abſtain, till they had cleared the city from the ſlaughter in it, and ſo had been able with propriety to make that religious proceſſion, which they had always intended, to the tomb of their Saviour; forms one of the moſt ſtriking pictures in the hiſtory of man, and is worthy of celebration by the tongue of the philoſopher, and the pen of the hiſtorian, for ever. When this was all over, and not before, '*tum* quicunque ege-'nus vel domum, vel aliquas divitias, invaſit, nun-'quam ulterius ullius locupletis tulit convicium, ſed 'ſemel poſſeſſa in jus adoptavit hæreditarium.'— Such is the full, the lively, and the curious hiſtory of the firſt cruſade, in William of Malmeſbury! So thoroughly unjuſt, is Mr. Gibbon's ſlighting inſinuation againſt it!

He wiſhes Malmeſbury had *not* given it, when every reader muſt thank him very cordially *for* it. He fancies Malmeſbury had only liſtened, to the 'tenue 'murmur' which had paſſed the Britiſh ſea. How could he ſo fancy, when Malmeſbury has given us ſuch a particular and pointed account of the cruſade? But at the *end* of this *general* account, Malmeſbury propoſes to *enlarge* and *continue* it; to give the *particular* hiſtory, of each leader in this and the future cruſades. '*Singulorum* procerum facta et exitus 'ſcripto inſigniam,' he ſays; 'nec quicquam veri-'tati, ſecundúm relatorum meorum credulitatem, 'ſubtraham: nullus veró, cui amplior provenit 'geſtorum notitia, me pro incurioſo arguat, quia ‘trans oceanum Britannicum abditos, vix tenui murmure, rerum Aſianarum fama illuſtrat[1].’ He thus apologiſes for the *future* ſlenderneſs of his materials, in this *minute* and *ſucceeding* hiſtory. And he accordingly gives us directly, the ſpecial hiſtory of Godfrey, King of Jeruſalem, of Baldwin his brother and ſucceſſor, and of the ſecond Baldwin, the ſucceſſor of both; declaring that he takes his account of the former Baldwin, ‘fidei ſoliditate accommodatâ dictis Fulcherii Carnotenſis, qui, capellanus ipſius, aliquanta de ipſo ſcripſit, ſtilo non equidem agreſti, ſed (ut dici ſolet) ſine nitore ac palæſtrâ, et qui alios admonere potuit ut accuratiùs ſcriberent[2].’ He then proceeds to the hiſtory of Bohemund King of Antioch, and of Tancred and Roger, his reſpective ſucceſſors. The account of Raimund follows next, and of his ſons William and Pontius, ſucceſſively kings of Tripolis. And the whole cloſes with the private adventures, of Robert Duke of Normandy. Malmeſbury therefore means not to cenſure his preceding and general accounts, as if they were only the effuſions of a ſlight and ſlender report. They are *evidently* ſomething, infinitely ſuperior to this. Indeed, I *muſt* ſay it in juſtice to the truth, that they are even *ſuperiour* to Mr. Gibbon's; being not bent by the force of ‘philoſophy,’ into all the little frauds of writing, the artful ſuppreſſion, the dexterous diſtortion, and the wilful falſehood; and exhibiting the heroes of the cruſade, in their *native* colours and *juſt* proportions, in all their *romantic majeſty* of character.

---

[1] Fol. 80.

fol. 81.

Malmeſbury, ſays Mr. Gibbon, 'wrote about 'the year 1130.' But he wrote earlier. The concluſion of his *fifth* book is dated by himſelf in the 28th of Henry the Firſt, according to one copy, and in the 20th, according to the common and earlier copies. 'Hæc habui—de geſtis Anglorum quæ 'dicerem,' he ſays to Robert Earl of Glouceſter, 'ab adventu eorum in Angliam uſque in annum *viceſimum* fæliciſſimi regni patris veſtri[1].' And, as Henry began his reign in Auguſt 1100, Malmeſbury wrote the hiſtory of the cruſades in his *fourth* book, on or before 1120, and about twenty or twenty-two years only after the ſtorm of Jeruſalem. As a *cotemporary* and a *dignified* writer, therefore, he ought to have been ſelected by Mr. Gibbon, for one of his principal authorities in the firſt cruſade. We have already ſeen ſome errours that Mr. Gibbon would have avoided, and many beauties that he might have adopted, by doing ſo. His ſiege of Jeruſalem would have been particularly improved, by the act; and his ſtorm of Jeruſalem have been ſaved from that accurſed calumny, with which it is now polluted. But he choſe to inſert the calumny. He choſe to take for his authors, Elmacin, Abulpharagius, and M. de Guignes from an unknown Aboulmahaſen; *becauſe they had it.* Yet, why did not he alſo chuſe to take Abulfeda with them; who extends *their* maſſacre of 'three days' over 'a 'whole week;' and makes the Chriſtians to ſlay *ſeventy thouſand* perſons *in the temple or moſque on Mount Moriah*[1], when we know for certain from Malmeſbury that there were only *ten thouſand*, and when theſe ſurely are ſufficient for the garriſon of a ſingle moſque? He was afraid to ſtretch the *improbable* falſehood of *that*, to ſuch a ſtraining length of incredibility. The ſeventy thouſand perſons in the moſque too, he thought proper to overlook; and makes them the amount of all, that were ſlaughtered in the whole town[2]. He thus deviates from Abulfeda, while he follows authors not ſuperiour in reputation; and corrects him though he cites him not. And he choſe to wander, in the train of Elmacin, Abulpharagius, and the unpubliſhed Aboulmahaſen, for the length of the ſlaughter and the number of the ſlain; rather than follow the beſt authority in the world, the letter of Godfrey himſelf, which ſhews the ſlaughter to have continued only for one day and during the reſiſtance; and rather than copy the next beſt account in the world, the narration of a judicious cotemporary, which coincides with the letter entirely, proves the ſlaughter in the ſtreets to have been only during the ſtorm and the reſiſtance, and ſtates the number ſlain at the moſque to have been only ten thouſand. To the teſtimony of a very reſpectable cotemporary, and to the concurrent evidence of an eye-witneſs, an actor, and a commander; he prefers the authority of Elmacin, who lived *near a century and a half* afterwards, of Abulpharagius, who wrote near *three centuries* from the time, and probably, though uncited, of Abulfeda, who died near *three centuries and a half* later than the fact [r].

---

[1] Fol. 98. So in fol. 87, concerning Robert Duke of Normandy impriſoned by Henry the Firſt in 1106, one copy ſays 'utrùm aliquando ſit exiturus, vero vacillante, in dubio,' and another, 'nec unquam uſque ad obitum relaxatus.'

---

[1] Mod. Univ. Hiſt. iii. 304.

[2] p. 60.

Having ſaid this, I will annex the account of this part of the ſtorm, which is given us by Knolles, and is all conformable to what I have ſaid. 'In this 'confuſion,' ſays the truly reſpectable author, if reſpectability is attached to veracity in preference to falſehood, 'a wonderful number of the better ſort of 'Turks, retiring unto Salomon's temple, there to 'do their laſt devoire, made there a great and ter-'rible fight, armed with deſpaire to endure any 'thinge; and the victorious Chriſtians no leſſe diſ-'daining, after the winning of the citie, to find 'there ſo great reſiſtance. In this deſperat con-'flict, fought with wonderful obſtinacie of mind, 'many fell on both ſides: but the Chriſtians came 'on ſo fiercely with deſire of blood, that, *breaking* 'into the temple, *the foremoſt of them were by the* '*preſſe that followed after,* violently *thruſt upon the* '*weapons of their enemies,* and ſo miſerably ſlaine. 'Neither did the Turks, thus oppreſſed, give it o-'ver; but, as men reſolved to die, deſperatly 'fought it out with invincible courage, not at the 'gates of the temple only, but even in the *middeſt* 'thereof alſo; *where* was to be ſeene *great heapes,*

---

[r] Prideaux's Letter to a Deiſt, p. 163, 153, and 154.

'both of the *victors* and the *vanquiſhed, ſlaine indif-* 'ferently together. All *the pavement of the temple* '*ſwam with blood*; in ſuch ſort, that *a man could not* '*ſet his feet*, but either upon *ſome dead man*, or *over* '*the ſhooes in blood.* Yet, for all that, the obſtinate 'enemie ſtill held the *vaults* and *top*,' meaning the arches within and the roof above, 'of the temple; 'when as the night came ſo faſt on,' it being, as Knolles has ſaid before, 'midday' when the ſtorm began, 'that the Chriſtians were glad to make an 'end of the ſlaughter, and to ſound a retrait. *The* '*next day* (for that *proclamation was made*, for *mercie* 'to be *ſhewed* unto *all ſuch* as ſhould *lay downe their* '*weapons*) the Turks, that yet held *the upper part* 'of the temple, *came down and yeelded themſelves.* 'Thus was the famous citie of Jeruſalem with great 'bloodſhed, but far greater honor, recovered by 'theſe worthy Chriſtians, in the yeare 1099[1]. And ſuch is the hiſtory, which is given us by the pen of Chriſtian probity; the very oppoſite of that, which is held out to us by the hand of Mahometan knavery!

Text. 'The northern monarchs of *Scotland, Den-* '*mark*, Sweden, and Poland, were yet ſtrangers to 'the paſſions and intereſts of the ſouth[2].' Note. 'The author of the Eſprit des Croiſades has *doubted*, 'and *might have diſbelieved*, the cruſade and tragic 'death of Prince Sueno, with 1500 or 15000 *Danes*, 'who was cut off by Sultan Soliman in Cappado-

---

[1] Knolles, p. 23.

[2] p. 21.

'cia, but who ſtill lives in the poem of Taſſo (tom. 'iv. p. 111—115).' Yet Mr. Gibbon in a diſtant page inconſiſtently ſays, that there were in the cruſade 'bands of adventurers from Spain, Lombardy, 'and England; and from the diſtant bogs and '*mountains* of Ireland or *Scotland*, iſſued ſome naked 'and ſavage fanatics, ferocious at home but unwar'like abroad[1].' Note ſays, that 'William of 'Malmeſbury *expreſsly* mentions the *Welſh* and '*Scots*, &c.;' and that Guibert notes '*Scotorum*, 'apud ſe ferocium, alias imbellium, cuneos,' where 'the *crus intectum* and *hiſpida chlamys* may ſuit the 'Highlanders, but the *finibus uliginoſis* may rather 'apply to the Iriſh bogs.' The Scotch of Guibert may ſeem to be the Iriſh only, from the 'finibus 'uliginoſis.' Nor would the dreſs be any argument to the contrary. The Iriſh at this period wore the ſame dreſs, with the Highlanders. But the Scoti of Guibert are what their name imports, the preſent inhabitants of Scotland, and the ſame with the Scots of Malmeſbury. And it was then as common with foreigners, to diſcriminate Scotland by its *bogs*, as it now is with ourſelves to denote Ireland. This is evident from the circular letter of Frederick Emperour of Germany, to the nations around; on the wild irruptions of the Tartars. It is in M. Paris, p. 498, and is quoted by Mr. Gibbon himſelf in p. 304. There the writer ſpeaks of 'cruenta *Hybernia* cum agili Walliâ, *paluſtris Sco'tia*.' &c. And, as Mr Gibbon might have ſaved at once the uncertainty and the contradiction, by ſtating the truth; ſo he ſhould never have run into the new contradiction, of aſſerting thoſe to be 'naked' in the text, whom he covers with a *rough mantle*, 'hiſpida chlamys,' in the note. This is bringing back that poetical *bull* of Blackmore's, which (I underſtand) is *ſuppreſſed* in the *late* edition or editions of the poem;

---

[1] P. 39—40.

> A painted veſt Prince Vortiger had on,
> Which from a naked Pict his grandſire won.

Nor is Mr. Gibbon's conduct leſs remarkable, in other points. He intimates that Scotland ſent no adventurers to the cruſade. Yet he cites Malmeſbury, for Scotland actually ſending ſome; and Guibert, for the character of the ſent. He cites Guibert in the note, as confirmed by Malmeſbury, for the *Scots* actually going; and yet in the text ſtates them to be *either* Scots *or* Iriſh. But let us alſo obſerve Mr. Gibbon's conduct about Denmark. This, we are told, equally ſent no men to the cruſade. Yet afterwards Mr. Gibbon cites a paſſage from Malmeſbury, that proves it did ſend ſome. He however quotes *only* till *he comes to the proving words*, and then laps up the ſentence with an *&c.* 'William of Malmeſbury expreſsly mentions the 'Welſh and Scots, *&c.*' This pregnant *&c.* produces theſe words in William: 'tunc Wallenſis 'venationem ſaltuum, tunc Scotus familiaritatem 'pulicum, *tunc Danus continuationem potuum, tunc* '*Noricus*

'*Noricus cruditatem reliquit piſcium*[1].' And the whole gives us a remarkable proof, of Mr. Gibbon's aſtoniſhing inattention to his own aſſertions and evidences. The Norwegians, the Danes, and the Scots appear as cruſaders in the very paſſages to which Mr. Gibbon has referred, in the very quotations which Mr. Gibbon has produced, and in his own notes and text. But Mr. Gibbon's management of this laſt reference ſhews us ſomething more. He cites Malmeſbury for the *Welſh* going to the cruſade; and then, either ſtrangely omits them in his text, or more ſtrangely comprehends them under the *Engliſh*. In this paſſage alſo, Malmeſbury ſpecifies the *Dane* and the *Norwegian* as equal cruſaders with all. Mr. Gibbon, however, ſtops ſhort in his quotation from it, ſhuts them both out of his note, and excludes them both from his text; becauſe he recollects what he has ſaid before of Denmark ſending *no* cruſaders, and foreſees the authority claſhing with his aſſertion. He thus ſhews us his memory, at the expence of his probity. And he keeps the reſt of the paſſage under his thumb, becauſe it will encounter what he has ſaid before; and ſuppreſſes the contradicting authority, rather than turn back, and correct the falſe aſſertion by it. Nor is the ſtory of Sueno the Dane, which the author of Eſprit de Croiſades *doubts*, and which Mr. Gibbon *diſbelieves*, improbable in itſelf, or unfounded (I apprehend) on a fact. In Norway ſays Malmeſbury, 'filii ultimi Magni, Haſten et Si-

---

[1] Fol. 75.

'wardus, regno *adhuc* diviſo imperitant: quorum 'poſterior *adoleſcens ſpecioſus et audax, non multûm eſt* 'quód *Jeroſolymam* per *Angliam* navigavit; *innumera* '*et præclara facinora* contra Saracenos *conſummans*, 'præſertim in obſidione Sydonis, quæ pro conſcien- 'tiâ Turcorum immania in Chriſtianos fremebat[1].' This is, in all probability, the very hero of Taſſo. He was indeed a Norwegian. But Norway having ſome time before been reduced by Denmark[2], the Dane and the Norwegian would eaſily be confounded in the South. We have indeed an actual King of Denmark, engaged in the cruſade; but he died at ſea before he reached Jeruſalem. Henry, 'Jeroſolymam adiit medioque mari ſpiritum evomuit[3].' And all ſerves to ſhew the exiſtence, in the frequency, of Daniſh and Norwegian cruſaders; very deciſively againſt Mr. Gibbon.

Chapter SECOND

or fifty-ninth.——This gives us the ſucceſs of the Greek emperor with his own troops over the Turks, in conſequence of the cruſade, 72—73; the anger of the cruſaders at the emperor, for leaving them, 73; one of their leaders paſſing back into Europe for ſuccours againſt the emperor, 73—74; his ineffectual return with them, 74; a ſupply ſent to the firſt cruſaders, 75; ſecond cruſade, 75; third, 75; the general numbers and character of each, 75—77;

---

[1] Fol. 60. [2] fol. 59. [3] fol. 60.

the conduct of the emperours towards them, 77—80; the general hiſtory of the ſupply ſent to the firſt cruſade, 80; that of the ſecond cruſade, 80—81; that of the third, 81—82; the perſeverance of Europe in the cruſades, 82—83; the character of St. Bernard, 83—84; his ſucceſs in preaching up the ſecond cruſade, 84—85; ſucceſs of the Turks againſt the cruſaders, 84—87; the character of him who was the cauſe of their ſucceſſes, 87—88; the taking of Egypt from the Saracens by the Turks, 88—89; the calling in of the cruſaders by the Saracens, 89; the expulſion of the Turks by the cruſaders, 89; their return, 89—90; their ſecond expulſion, 90; their return and reduction of Egypt, 90—91; the revolt of Egypt from the Turks under the commandant of their mercenaries, 92—93; the general ſucceſs of his ſon, Saladin, over the Saracens, the cruſaders, and the Turks, 93; the character of this ſon, 94—95; his reduction of the holy land up to Jeruſalem, 95—97; his taking Jeruſalem, 97—100; the third cruſade, 100—101; his being beat off from Tyre by the cruſaders, 101; their beſieging Acre, 101; their battles with Saladin before it, 102; their taking it, 103; the conduct of the kings of France and England reſpectively in Paleſtine, 103—104; the particular exploits of the king of England, 105—107; his treaty with Saladin and departure for England, 107—108; the civil wars among the Turks on Saladin's death, 108; the character of Innocent III. Pope of Rome, 108—109; author of the fourth and fifth cruſades, 109; an account of the fourth reſerved for the next chapter, 109; an account of the fifth, 109; its ill ſucceſs, and the reaſons, 109—110; a new cruſade under Frederic III. Emperor of Germany, 110—111; his general ſucceſs, though oppoſed and betrayed by the eaſtern Chriſtians, 111—113; the irruption of the Carizmans into Paleſtine, 113; the ſixth cruſade, that of St. Louis into Egypt, 113; his character, 113—114; his forces, 114; his ill ſucceſs, 115—116; the ſeventh cruſade, the ſecond under St. Louis, 116; his death at Tunis, 117; the ſtate of Egypt under the Mamalukes, 117—118; our Firſt Edward in Paleſtine, 118; reduction of almoſt all Paleſtine by the Mahometans, 119; the ſtate of the only town left, Acre, 119; its ſiege by the Mamalukes, 120; and its ſurrendery to them, 120. Such are the contents of this chapter. Nor let any one of my readers be too much ſtartled, when I rudely awaken him from his dream of reading, by telling him; that this *was to be* the hiſtory of the eaſtern empire's decline and fall. *That* it *was to be*, and *this* it *is*. And the reader, who has been awake to the digreſſions from the beginning of the chapter, muſt have gone on ſtep by ſtep in the turnings and windings of the whole labyrinth, expecting that every turn would be the laſt, and that he ſhould then recover the original line of the hiſtory. Yet he has found himſelf to his amazement, ſtill going on in the winding courſe; one turn coming after another, till he has been involved in mazes upon mazes, loſt in the inextricable labyrinth, and obliged to advance with his author and with ‘ confuſion worſe ‘ confounded,’ to the end of the whole.

In this hiſtory of events, either *totally* irrelative to the hiſtory of the decline and fall of the eaſtern empire, or affecting it only *in a point or two* of the whole; Mr. Gibbon has paſſed over ſome incidental touches of the times, that are peculiarly pleaſing in themſelves, and ought to have been ſtudiouſly ſelected by him. Concerning *ſugar* ſays Pliny: 'Saccharon et Arabia fert, ſed laudatius India; eſt 'autem mel in harundinibus collectum, gummium 'modo candidum, dentibus fragile, ampliſſimum 'nucis avellanæ magnitudine, *ad medicinæ tantùm* '*uſum*[1].' But this plant had been brought in the days of the cruſades, into other countries of Aſia. Baldwin the ſecond, King of Jeruſalem, marched by Antioch tó Laodicea towards Jeruſalem; but was much diſtreſſed in the way between Jeruſalem and Laodicea, by the want of proviſions, &c. 'At vero famem nonnihil levabant,' ſays an hiſtorian of the times, 'ARUNDINES MELLITAS continué dentibus terentes, quas *Cannamellas*, compoſito ex cannâ et melle nomine, vocant: ſic hi, 'omninó a *Tripolitanis* et *Cæſarienſibus* immenſo 'ære neceſſaria nacti, Jeroſolymam venêre[2].' And this was in all probability the firſt time, that the ſugar-cane, hitherto applied only to *medicinal* purpoſes, was *now uſed as food*; and the juice of it, which now conſtitutes ſo important an article in the food of the weſtern Europeans, *began to be ſo* in all probability, from this adventure of the cruſaders. This eaſtern *honey-cane* was now brought into Europe, was afterwards carried by the Portugueſe to Madeira with thoſe vines which conſtitute the great commerce of that iſland, and was thence tranſplanted to the grand nurſery of the cane for Europe at preſent, the Weſt Indies. The Portugueſe, ſays a Jew who wrote in Italy about the year 1502, in diſcovering Madeira 'in eâ plantâ-'runt—*cannas pro melle,*' he uſing nearly the very language of Malmeſbury, 'ad faciendum ſaccharum,—et vinea ex *vitibus Candiæ et Cypri!*'—The origin of that corroſive diſeaſe in Europe, which, for theſe three centuries nearly, has been ſo ſtrikingly the ſcourge of GOD upon promiſcuous whoredom; is much diſputed. Long before the Weſt Indies could poſſibly have compenſated the cruelties of Europe, by imparting this peſtilential bane to the European nations; evident ſymptoms of its commonneſs among us, appear in the regulations of our licenſed brothels. And that higher ſtage of this diſorder, which makes it act as a *cancer* upon all the affected parts of our frame, is now ſuppoſed therefore to have been the only part of the plague, which was imported from the Weſt-Indies. Yet even this is not true. The diſeaſe appears to have been in Europe, and with this ſharpeſt acrimony of it; ages before the diſcovery of America. This a very remarkable paſſage in a cotemporary hiſtory of the cruſades, ſufficiently

---

[1] Nat. Hiſt. xii. 8.

[2] Malmeſbury, fol. 81.

---

[1] Peritſol's Itinera Mundi, latinized by Hyde. Oxon 1691, p. 113—114. ad 179.

ſhews. Baldwin abovementioned married. 'Ad 'legitimum connubium non multò poſt *Comitiſſa* '*Siciliæ* Jeroſolymam venit—; et tunc quidem illam 'thoro recepit, ſed non multò poſt dimiſit. Aiunt '*incommodo tactam*, QUO EJUS GENITALIA CANCER, 'MORBUS INCURABILIS, EXESIT[1].' And as this lady came from Sicily, which had long been in the poſſeſſion of the *Arabs*; we apprehend the diſorder to have been derived from the ſame quarter, from which the ſmall-pox is known to have been, even from *Arabia*; and ſo to have formed with that, two of the curſes which Mahometaniſm inflicted upon Europe, which perhaps have outdone in miſchief the ravages of its arms, and have certainly ſurvived them in their conſequences. This hiſtorical argument, too, is apparently corroborated by the *relative* appellations, with which theſe two diſeaſes are diſtinguiſhed by us Europeans; the *great* and the *ſmall* pox, 'la *groſſe*' and 'la *petite* verole,' &c. plainly denoting the one to be *cotemporary* with the other, in the knowledge of Europe.—The *black woolly hair* of the natives on the coaſt of Guinea, is a very ſtriking circumſtance in the aſpect of them. The general blackneſs of their appearance they ſo far ſhare in common with others, as not to be blacker than their ſouthern neighbours, and to be only a degree or two blacker than their eaſtern. But their woolly hair is the ſtamp of nature, by which ſhe has marked them as diſtinct from all. Theſe *heteroclites* of the human race, were unknown to the Europeans in general; till the Portugueſe, beyond the middle of the fifteenth century, puſhed their navigation along the weſtern coaſt of Africa, and diſcovered them. And yet we have a curious paſſage in Malmeſbury's hiſtory of the cruſades, which pointed them out very ſtrongly to the eye of Britain particularly; about *two centuries and a half* before. Baldwin the ſecond, he ſays, marched from Jeruſalem to Aſcalon, then turned up into the mountains in purſuit of the Turks, beat them out of their caves by ſmoke, directed his courſe towards Arabia, and went by *Hebron* to the *Dead Sea*. 'Evadentes ergo lacum, venerunt ad villam ſanè 'locupletiſſimam, et mellitis pomis quæ dactylos 'dicunt fæcundam—;' dates from the neighbouring palms of Jericho: 'cætera timore incolarum 'abraſa, præter aliquantos *Æthiopes* FERRUGINEA 'CAPILLORUM LANUGINE fuliginem prætendentes.' Theſe were evidently the blacks of Guinea. Their name of Ethiopians, alſo, points out diſtinctly the channel, by which they had been derived from that diſtant coaſt. In 651 the Mahometan Arabs of Egypt 'ſo harraſſed the king of Nubia' or Ethiopia, 'who was a Chriſtian; that' he agreed 'to ſend the 'Arabs annually, by way of a tribute, *a vaſt num-* '*ber of Nubian or Ethiopian ſlaves* into Egypt. Such 'a tribute as this at that time was *more agreeable* to 'the Khalif, *than any other*; as the Arabs *then* 'made *no ſmall account* of *thoſe ſlaves*[1].' At this time therefore, began that kind of traffick in human fleſh,

---

[1] Malmeſbury, fol. 84.

---

[1] Mod. Univ. Hiſt. i. 525.

> Which ſpoils unhappy Guinea of its ſons.

Compelled to furniſh 'a vaſt number' of ſlaves every year, to the Arabs of Egypt; the king of Ethiopia naturally endeavoured to feed this great drain upon his ſubjects, from the natives of the neighbouring countries; ranged accordingly into all that vaſt *blank of geography* upon the map of the world, the ſpreading boſom of this ample continent; and even puſhed through it to its fartheſt extremities in the Weſt. He thus brought the blacks of Guinea for the firſt time, into the ſervice and families of the Eaſt. All theſe ſlaves, whether derived from the nearer neighbourhood of Ethiopia, fetched from the Mediterranean regions of Africa, or brought from the diſtant ſhores of the Atlantick; would all be denominated *Ethiopians*, from the country by which they were conveyed to the Arabs of Egypt. The Arabs therefore appear to have trained up blacks for the uſes of war, as we do a few occaſionally for drummers and fifers to our regiments; and even to have thrown them into large bodies of ſoldiery by themſelves. So early as the ſiege of Jeruſalem by the cruſaders in 1099, when the Arabs of Egypt were now in poſſeſſion of the city, having recently taken it from their Mahometan brethren the Turks; there were no leſs than *five hundred* Ethiopians at the ſtorm, that took refuge from it in the Tower of David, and there ſurrendered to the cruſaders, on condition of being allowed to march out to Aſcalon[1]; and, in the following year, the cruſaders met with ſome Ethiopians near Hebron, that are diſtinguiſhed from the former by their woolly heads, and were therefore the blacks of Guinea. So much earlier did the purchaſe of the inhabitants for ſlaves commence, than has been ever imagined; even ages before the Portugueſe laid open their country, to the intercourſe of Europe. Even after they had, the inhabitants were as regularly purchaſed for ſlaves by ſome of the ſtates adjoining, as they are now by the maritime Europeans. The Arabs of Egypt having reduced all the north of Africa, and carrying with them their love of black ſervants, would be ſure to open a ready communication for themſelves to their country. They certainly had one ſo early as 1512, and before the Europeans had any, for that purpoſe. They went from Barbary by a route, that was ſo much practiſed, as to be denominated expreſsly 'the way of 'the Camels.' Meeting together at 'the town of 'Cape Cantin,' that of Valadie near it, the commercial caravan traverſed 'the vaſt deſerts,' thoſe of Sarra which run, like the Tropic of Cancer over them, in a long line acroſs the country; to 'a place 'of great population called Hoden,' the Waden or Hoden of our maps, and a little to the ſouth-weſt of Cape Blanco. From Hoden they diverted on the left, and puſhed directly into the interiours of the continent, to reach 'Tegazza,' the Tagazel or Tagaza of our maps, and lying nearly eaſt of Hoden.

---

[1] Malmeſbury, p. 80.

den. Here aſſuredly they did, as the caravan does certainly at this day; and added to the other wares upon their camels, a quantity of *ſalt* from thoſe mines of rock ſalt, which are extraordinary enough to be noticed as rocks in our maps. This they carried, as they ſtill carry it, to 'Tanbut,' the Tombut of the maps, and a town in the heart of the African continent. And from this town they turned on the right for the ſea-coaſt again, and reached it in 'the great kingdom of Mele,' the Melli of our maps, to the ſouth of the Gambia, and juſt at the ſpringing (as it were) of that grand arch of ſea, which curves ſo deeply into the body of the land, and conſtitutes the extenſive Gulph of Guinea. At Melli and at Tombut they received *a meaſure of gold* for *a meaſure of ſalt.* The caravan collects gold at Tombut, to the preſent time. But at Melli they purchaſed gold, and alſo *ſilver*, in *pieces as large as pebbles.* And at Hoden they had *a great mart for ſlaves*; the blacks being brought thither from the countries adjoining, and bartered away to the traders [1]. Such was the Slave Coaſt and the Gold Coaſt, of former days! The ſtaple commodity of Hoden, is only transferred now to Whidah; and diverted from the Arabs of Barbary, to the Chriſtians of Europe. And ſhould any thing ſo wildly incredible happen, as that *all* the nations of Chriſtendom, in one common paroxyſm of philanthropy, ſhould abandon this commerce in ſervants, which has been proſecuted in all ages and under all religions; they would only abandon it to thoſe, who were originally poſſeſſed of it, who ſtill penetrate into the country, and who even puſh up to Gago at the very head of the Slave Coaſt; and leave the wool-headed natives of it, to *Mahometan* maſters in preference to *Chriſtian*. Under ſuch maſters they were in Judea, at the time of the cruſades. Nor had any European eye *then* ſeen one of *theſe* blacks. This is plain from what immediately follows in Malmeſbury. 'Quorum cædem,' he adds, 'noſtri æſtimantes infra 'virtutem ſuam, non eos irâ, *ſed riſu*, dignati ſunt[1].' And an army of Europeans, finding a number of Guinea blacks left in a town, near the ſouthern end of Judæa; ſeeing theſe blacks for the firſt time; and burſting out into a general fit of laughter, at the ſight of them; forms one of the moſt curious ſketches in hiſtory.

---

[1] Peritſol, p. 122—125, and maps for Mod. Univ. Hiſt. Peritſol wrote (as I have obſerved) about 1512, in general (p. 179); but after 1534, in one particular, p. 91.

In the arrangement of the parts of this chapter, we have great confuſion. In p. 75 we have an intimation of a ſupply ſent to the firſt cruſaders, of a ſecond cruſade, and of a third. We then have an account, of the general numbers and character of each, 75—77; the conduct of the emperours towards them, 77—80; the general hiſtory of the ſupply, 80; of the ſecond cruſade, 80—81; and of the third, 81—82; and of the perſeverance of Europe in theſe cruſades, 82—83. And, after all, we come back in 83—84 to the character of St. Bernard, and his ſucceſs in preaching up—a *new* cruſade, to be ſure. But let not the reader preſume too freely on propriety, in Mr. Gibbon. The cruſade, which St. Bernard is *now* preaching up, is one of the *foregoing.* It is one of thoſe which we have already diſpatched. It is not even the laſt of them. It is the *ſecond.* So ſtrangely are we moving ſometime backwards and ſometime forwards, in the courſe of the hiſtory! But there is alſo a grand omiſſion in it. In p. 73 we are told, that Bohemond and 'his Norman followers were inſufficient to withſtand the *hoſtilities* of 'the Greeks and Turks.' But what had provoked the hoſtilities of the *Greeks,* whether actual or apprehended, between this Norman prince of Antioch and the Greek emperor? This Mr. Gibbon has moſt ſtrangely concealed. And, for want of this neceſſary information, the reader is all in the dark about the meaning of the movements before him. He ſees Bohemond 'embracing the magnanimous 'reſolution of leaving the defence of Antioch to his 'kinſman, the faithful Tancred; of arming the 'Weſt againſt the Byzantine empire; and of executing the deſign, which he inherited from the 'leſſons and example of his father Guiſcard.' But what the cauſe, real or pretended, of this reſolution is; Mr. Gibbon does not tell us. We then behold Bohemond 'embarking clandeſtinely' for Europe, received in France with applauſe, married to the king's daughter, and 'returning with the braveſt 'ſpirits of the age.' Yet ſtill what the ground for all this is, Mr. Gibbon never tells us. And his hiſtory, for want of this intelligence, becomes a mere ſcene of puppet-ſhow to us; movements without any moving principles, and operations without any im-

---

[1] Fol. 83.

pelling

pelling cauſe. Mr. Gibbon ſhould have told us, that the emperour required Bohemond to hold the ſovereignty of Antioch in dependence upon him; a point, to which Mr. Gibbon himſelf, however abſurdly with his previous ſuppreſſion of it, makes a direct reference in p. 74, when, on terminating the quarrel, he ſays 'the homage was clearly ſtipulated:' that Bohemond refuſed, even claimed Laodicea from the emperour as a part of his principality of Antioch, and even went ſo far as to ſeize it; another point to which Mr. Gibbon himſelf alludes, when, at the ſame time, he ſays 'the boundaries' of his principality 'were ſtrictly defined:' and that, in conſequence of this rebellion againſt and attack upon him, by one of the chief of the cruſaders; the emperour attacked and defeated a fleet of new cruſaders, coming from the Weſt[1].' Theſe incidents throw a full light upon the darkened narrative. We ſee the deſigns of Bohemond, and the hoſtilities of the Greeks, clearly elucidated. And the ſcene of puppet-ſhow becomes, a picture of living manners and of human tranſactions[2].

'The principality of Antioch was left without a 'head, by the ſurpriſe and captivity of Bohemond; 'his ranſom had oppreſſed him with a heavy debt[3].' What all this means, no one ſhall know from Mr. Gibbon. He muſt refer to Malmeſbury or ſome other author, to be his commentator upon Mr. Gibbon.

---

[1] Ant. Univ. Hiſt. xvii. 151.

[2] It is remarkable, that Malmeſbury has equally omitted theſe impelling incidents.

[3] p. 73.

bon. From Malmeſbury he will then learn, 'Boamundum—captum et in catenas ejectum, a quodam Daniſman gentili, et in illis terris potenti;' that 'pollicitus—Boamundus continuam gentili concordiam,' and not, as Mr. Gibbon ſtates it, paying a *ranſom*, 'revertit Antiochiam, *argenteos compedes* quibus illigatus fuerat *deferens ſecum*[1].' This is another inſtance, of Mr. Gibbon's dark mode of writing the hiſtory, where he thinks himſelf obliged to be brief. And theſe unite with many other inſtances to ſhew us, that this hiſtorical painter knows not how to give us the features of the times, compreſſed into a miniature piece; and that he can work only upon figures nearly as big as the life.

'The ſword, which had been the inſtrument of their [the cruſaders] victory, was the pledge and title of their juſt independence. It does not appear, that the emperor attempted to revive his obſolete claims over the kingdom of Jeruſalem; but the borders of Cilicia and Syria were *more recent* [he ſhould have ſaid *more recently*] in his poſſeſſion.' Note. 'The kings of Jeruſalem ſubmitted however to a nominal dependence, and in the dates of their inſcriptions (one is ſtill legible in the church at Bethlem) they reſpectfully placed before their own, the name of the reigning emperour[2].' We here ſee again what we muſt again call, the *natural confuſedneſs* of Mr. Gibbon's underſtanding. The ſword of the cruſaders, we are told, became with them 'the pledge and title of their

---

[1] Fol. 82 and 85.

[2] p. 73.

'juſt independence,' Yet with this ſword in their hands, and in their moſt powerful kingdom, we find, they actually reſigned their 'juſt independence,' and 'ſubmitted to a—dependence' upon the emperour. This dependence is ſaid indeed to have been 'nominal;' but what did the emperour aſk more, or what more did their ſword refuſe to allow him? When the diſpute with the kingdom of Antioch was terminated by the emperour, as Mr. Gibbon himſelf tells us, 'the boundaries were ſtrictly defined,' and 'the homage was clearly ſtipulated.' The homage, therefore, was all. This was a real, not a nominal, dependence. As ſuch, it was inſiſted upon by the emperour; and, as ſuch, it had been refuſed by Bohemond before. It was as real, as the definition of the boundaries was. The kings of Jeruſalem always paid it, we *find*, though the firſt king of Antioch refuſed it; *becauſe* there was no diſpute between them and the emperour, as there was between the emperour and him. And accordingly we find alſo, from that moſt authentic of all evidences, a formal inſcription ſet upon a church by them; that they *ſhewed* and *owned* their *real* dependence upon the emperour, in the moſt ſtriking way in which they could own and ſhew it, by 'reſpectfully placing *before* their 'own *the name of the reigning emperour.*' Yet 'it 'does not *appear*,' we are told by Mr Gibbon, 'that 'the emperour *attempted* to revive his *obſolete* claims 'over the kingdom of Jeruſalem.' It certainly *does* appear from Mr. Gibbon himſelf. It appears from this very inſcription. He not only *attempted* to revive his claims, but actually *revived* them *with-*

out reſiſtance. Yet, becauſe Mr. Gibbon finds no reſiſtance, he aſſerts there was no revival; and the unreſiſted acknowledgment of the claim, he conſiders as an evidence againſt it's exiſtence. So ſtrangely does his underſtanding wreſt objects, from their natural and obvious propriety! At laſt however he found an apparent and a poſitive proof, of their dependence. He did not then correct what he had ſaid before, by what he had diſcovered now. No! he was too indolent, or too preſuming, for that. He makes this new diſcovery to bend and warp with his old ideas. He aſſerts the new-diſcovered dependence, to be merely nominal; when even, if nominal, it goes *againſt* his aſſertion, and when it is apparently real. And he finally places this new diſcovery at the foot of the old aſſertion, muffled indeed by this diſtinction of a *nominal* dependence, and yet ſpeaking loudly againſt the aſſertion.

But we have not done with this paſſage. The claim of the emperour over the kingdom of Jeruſalem, is ſaid to be 'obſolete.' This therefore is urged as an argument, *why* he did not attempt to revive his claim. Yet he revived it, as Mr. Gibbon has already ſhewn us, over *Antioch.* In what year, then, was Antioch reduced by the Saracens, and in what Jeruſalem? Jeruſalem was reduced in 637, according to Mr Gibbon himſelf, and Antioch, according to Mr. Gibbon alſo, in—638[1]. Yet the emperour's claim of homage from Jeruſalem, was never revived *becauſe* it was obſolete; and was not too obſolete, to be revived over Antioch. So much efficacy has the difference of a *ſingle year*, in annihilating and preſerving rights! But the 'borders of 'Cilicia and Syria were more recent in his poſſeſſion,' than Jeruſalem. Was not Antioch, then, on the borders of Syria towards Cilicia? It certainly was. *All* Syria, according to Mr. Gibbon himſelf, was reduced by the Saracens in 638[1]; and, 'to the north of 'Syria, they paſſed mount Taurus,' in 639, ſays the margin, 'and reduced to their obedience the province 'of Cilicia[2].' So *much more* 'recent' in their poſſeſſion were 'the borders of Cilicia and Syria,' than Jeruſalem! They were even *one or two* years. This, in Mr. Gibbon's forgetfulneſs of facts and indiſtinctneſs of recollection, is made equivalent to one or two ages. And, what aggravates very greatly the contradictorineſs of all this, he has ſaid it all, concerning the *obſoleteneſs* of the emperour's claim over the kingdom of Jeruſalem in the province of Syria, concerning his not *attempting to revive* it, and concerning the borders of Cilicia and Syria being *more* recent than Jeruſalem in his poſſeſſion, and *therefore* claimed by him; when he previouſly tells us in the moſt explicit terms, that 'his *ancient* and '*perpetual* claim *ſtill* embraced the kingdoms of *Syria* and *Egypt*[3].' Such a chaos of confuſion, ſuch a maſs of fighting and warring elements, does the hand of contradiction work up, in the pages of Mr. Gibbon's hiſtory!

---

[1] Vol. v. 320 and 323.

---

[1] Vol. v. 326

[2] Vol. v. 330.

[3] p. 34.

Text. 'The *Seljukian* dynaſty of Roum had, after the loſs of Nice to the cruſaders, Cogni or *Iconium* for its capital.' Note. 'See, in the learned work of M. de Guignes—, the hiſtory of the *Seljukians* of *Iconium*—, as far *as may be collected* from the Greeks, Latins, and *Arabians*. The *laſt* are *ignorant* or *regardleſs* of the affairs of *Roum*[1].' This is a very extraordinary inſtance of contradiction, in two *near* and *neighbouring* poſitions. *In proof* that 'the Seljukian dynaſty of Roum' had Iconium for its capital, we are referred to a hiſtory in M. de Guignes. *In proof* that this hiſtory is ſufficient evidence, we are told it is collected from the Greeks, Latins, and Arabians. And then we are finally told, that it *cannot* be collected from the Arabians, becauſe the Arabians are 'either ignorant or regardleſs' of this part of the hiſtory.—Text. 'Iconium, an *obſcure* and inland town.' Note. 'Iconium is mentioned as a ſtation by Xenophon, and by Strabo with the ambiguous title of Κωμοπολις,' or the city-village. 'Yet St. Paul found in that place a *multitude* (πληθος) of Jews and Gentiles. Under the corrupt name of Kunijah, it is deſcribed as a great city—(Abulfeda—)[2].' Thus Iconium is pronounced an *obſcure* town. The evidence for this is one authority, which ſpeaks of it as a mere *ſtation*; two authorities, that make it *a great and populous* town; and a fourth, that *trims* between the oppoſed teſtimonies, and calls it a city and a village in one. We thus advance by regular ſteps from an obſcure and ſtationary town, to a city-like kind of village, and to a populous and large city. And three out of the four references, contradict at once the firſt and the text.——Text. ' *Only* ' one man was left behind for—ſeven widows.' Note. ' *Pene* jam non inveniunt quem apprehendant ſeptem mulieres unum virum[1].' The *pene* of the primary hiſtorian is made *only* in the ſecondary, and the text violates the truth of the note.——We ſaw in the laſt volume, that Mr. Gibbon made a grand attempt, to prove the nocturnal journey of Mahomet from Mecca to Jeruſalem, and from Jeruſalem to heaven, *not* intended by Mahomet for a reality, but *only* a dream. I particularly produced in proof to the contrary, that the general of Omar, the ſecond ſucceſſor of Mahomet, conſidered it as a reality; becauſe he urged the ſurrender of Jeruſalem to him, as the place, from the temple of which Mahomet aſcended in one night to heaven. I might alſo have added, that, in the very ſame year, one Kais Ebn Amer, an old man who had been particularly converſant with Mahomet, being brought as a priſoner before the Roman emperour, and being interrogated by him concerning Mahomet, anſwered; ' that he *really* performed a night-journey to heaven, ' *actually* converſed there with God himſelf, and ' received ſeveral inſtitutions *immediately* from him[2].' And, to my agreeable ſurpriſe, I find in this volume, that Mr Gibbon *now* is *entirely of my opinion.* The Mahometans at Jeruſalem, he ſays, were allowed to

---

[1] p. 74. [2] p. 74.

---

[1] P. 85.

[2] Mod. Univ. Hiſt. i. 450.

'pray and preach in the moſch of the temple' [he ſhould have ſaid, in the moſch *or* temple], '*from* '*whence the prophet undertook his nocturnal journey to* '*heaven*[1].' So little impreſſion do Mr. Gibbon's *own* arguments make upon *himſelf*, even in points important to *his* cauſe of Mahometaniſm, and laboured with particular care by *his* pen; that he ſoon forgets them, relapſes back into the opinions that he had *refuted*, and ſhews the triumph of nature evident over the ſophiſtications of art.

In the two preceding volumes, I have pointed out the frequent recurrence of Mr. Gibbon's ſpirit, to ideas of laſciviouſneſs and to intimations of impurity. We have another inſtance of this, in the preſent volume. This is ſuch as I *can* lay before my readers, without offending their delicacy. I ſhall therefore do ſo. Text. 'Only one man was 'left behind for the *conſolation* of ſeven *widows*.' Note. '*Penè* jam non inveniunt quem apprehendant ſeptem *mulieres* unum virum[2].' Here is no hint about *widows*; the paſſage ſpeaks only of *women*. The *conſolation* alſo is adminiſtered merely, by the prurient pen of Mr. Gibbon. And, to crown this ſally, Mr. Gibbon adds this to the note: 'We muſt be careful not to conſtrue *pene* as a ſubſtantive.' So apt is Mr. Gibbon to take fire in his fancy, at the ſlighteſt approach of a ſenſual idea; and ſo ready to twiſt and torture an innocent word, in order to gratify his ſenſual luxuriance of taſte!

Miſquotations. 'In the CALIPH's treaſure were

---

[1] p. 113.

[2] p. 85.

'found a *ruby* weighing ſeventeen Egyptian drachms —(Renaudot, p. 536)[1].' The words in Renaudot are theſe: '*Rubinorum* majorum, qui drachmarum 'Egyptiacarum ſeptemdecim pondus æquabant, '*linea*,' a *ſtring* of *rubies*, not a ſingle ruby.—— 'The moſt numerous portion of the inhabitants was 'compoſed of the *Greek* and *Oriental* Chriſtians, 'whom *experience had taught* to prefer the Mahometan before the Latin yoke (Renaudot,—p. '545)[2].' Renaudot's words are theſe: 'Mox Saladinus Hieroſolyma obſedit; nec cepiſſet abſque 'civium diſcordiâ et *Chriſtianorum Melchitarum* proditione. Nam per quendam Joſephum Elbatith '*ex eâdem ſectâ*, qui negotiandi cauſa multoties in 'urbem receptus erat, eos ad excutiendum Francorum jugum, quos numero ſuperabant, incitavit.' *Here* we have no intimation, whatever we may have in Mr. Gibbon, of 'experience having taught' the old and Melchite Chriſtians of Jeruſalem, to prefer the Mahometans to the Latins for maſters. A fear of the ſiege, a feeling of its terrours, a deſpair of relief, and a promiſe of favourable terms, might each or all induce them to clamour for a capitulation. And Mr. Gibbon has again loaded the credit of Renaudot, by ſaying from him what he does not ſay himſelf.

---

[1] p. 88.

[2] p. 98.

Chapter THIRD,

or Sixtieth.——This repreſents to us the Greeks arrogating to themſelves the knowledge of divinity, and the Latins deſpiſing the ſubtilty of the Greeks in it, 122; the differences between the eaſtern and weſtern churches, concerning the proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt, 122-123; the uſe of leavened or un-leavened bread in the euchariſt, 123; the eating of things ſtrangled and of blood, faſting on Saturday, eating milk and cheeſe in the firſt week of Lent, and indulging the weak monks with fleſh, 123; concerning the uſe of animal oil inſtead of vegetable in the unction of baptiſm, reſerving the adminiſtration of this unction to biſhops, decorating the biſhops with rings, ſhaving the faces of prieſts, and baptizing infants by a ſingle immerſion, 124; and concerning the ſupremacy of the patriarch of Conſtantinople and the Pope of Rome, 124-126; the mutual hatred of the Greeks and Latins in the cruſades, 126-127; many Latins, who were ſettled at Conſtantinople, maſſacred, 127-130; the reign of Iſaac Angelus emperor of Conſtantinople, 130-131; the revolt of the Bulgarians and Wallachians from the empire and church of Conſtantinople, 131-132; Iſaac depoſed by his brother Alexius, 132-133; the fourth cruſade preached up, 134-135; the perſons engaged in it, 135-136; their application to the Venetians for ſhips, 136-137; the general hiſtory of Venice to this time, 137-139; the confederacy between the cruſaders and Venetians, 139-141; the cruſaders aſſembling at Venice

nice and being diverted into Dalmatia, 141-144; again diverted towards Conſtantinople, by Alexius ſon to the depoſed emperor Iſaac, 144-145; a part of the army, on this, leaving the reſt and going for Jeruſalem, 146; and the reſt ſailing for Conſtantinople, landing at it, beſieging it, admitted into the town on the reſtoration of Iſaac, again beſieging the town on the ſecond depoſition of Iſaac, taking, and plundering it, 146-173. All the firſt part of this chapter, therefore, is a ſtring of digreſſions. The differences between the two churches, had either no influence at all, or a very ſlight one, in this attack of the Latins upon the Greek empire. They do not ſeem to have had any at all. Or, if they had, they were only as the duſt of the ſcale in addition to the weight within it. And they ought not, if the ſlighteſt attention had been paid to propriety by Mr. Gibbon, to unity of deſign and to reſponſiveneſs of execution; to have been once thought of in a work, that is to give us *only* the 'important,' and 'the moſt' important, circumſtances of the hiſtory. But nothing can ſtop Mr. Gibbon's predominant love, for theological diſſertation. He burſts every band, that would tie him up from indulging it. And then he riots in the uſe of his liberty, like the full-fed ſtallion of the Iliad.

Δεσμον απορρηξας θειει ϖεδιοιο κροαινων
Ειωθως λουεσθαι εϋρρειος ϖοταμοιο,
Κυδιοων· υψου δε καρη εχει, αμφι δε χαιται
Ωμοις αϊσσονται· ο δ' αγλαϊηφι ϖεποιθως,
Ριμφα ε γουνα φερει μετα τ' ηθεα και νομον ιππων.

And the hiſtorian is transformed into the theologue, merely to exhibit the former in all the *confident* impertinence of digreſſion, and to expoſe the latter in all the *common-place* futility of unbelief.

The Latins are ſaid to have 'deſpiſed in their 'turn the reſtleſs and ſubtle levity of the Orientals, 'the authors of every hereſy; and to have bleſſed 'their own ſimplicity, which was content to hold 'the tradition of the apoſtolic church[a].' And 'yet,' as we are told in *the very next* words, 'ſo 'early as in the *ſeventh* century, the ſynods of *Spain*, 'and afterwards of *France*, *improved* or *corrupted* 'the Nicene creed, on the myſterious ſubject of 'the Third Perſon of the Trinity,' by adding that he proceeded from the *Son* as well as the Father. The ſecond ſentence is an *incomparable* proof, of the poſition in the firſt. The Latins *ſhewed* their contempt for 'the reſtleſs and ſubtle levity' of the Greeks, and *proved* their own adherence to 'the 'tradition of the church;' by *adopting* the very *creed* of the *Greeks*, and even by *adding* to it. One could hardly think it poſſible for a rational being, to put two ſuch contradictory ſentences ſo cloſe together. All muſt be attributed to a ſtrange want of clearneſs and diſtinctneſs, in Mr. Gibbon's powers of diſcernment. We have ſeen ſo many inſtances of the ſame claſhing of ideas before, as can leave us no room to doubt of this fatal defect in his underſtanding. Spirited, vivid, and ingenious, he is certainly very confuſed. His mind ſhoots out in vigorous ſallies of thought occaſionally, but cannot purſue clearly a ſteady train of operations. It is ſometimes confounded, as it is here, by the very *ſecond* operation. And, with ſuch an unhappy diſpoſition of underſtanding, it is no wonder that he is an infidel. How could *he* be expected to comprehend the grand ſyſtem of Chriſtianity, to ſee parts harmonizing with parts, and every complication uniting into a regular whole; who cannot arrange his own thoughts with preciſion, who is perpetually recoiling from the very line which he has preſcribed to his own motions, and confounding himſelf by the contradictorineſs of his own ideas? Nor let us overlook another, though ſlighter, inſtance of this contradictorineſs. It is this. The text ſays, that, ' in the freedom of the table, the *gay* ' *petulance* of the *French* ſometimes forgot the em- ' peror of the Eaſt[1].' And the note adds, *confirming* to *weaken* the poſition; that ' if theſe merry ' companions were *Venetians*, it was *the inſolence of* ' *trade and a commonwealth.*' Could any thing in nature, but the derangement of an infidel underſtanding, generate ſuch contrarieties as theſe?

---

[a] P. 122.

Falſe or harſh language.—P. 122. Text. ' The ' Roman pontiffs affected—moderation; *they*,' &c. Note. ' Before the ſhrine of St. Peter, *he* placed,' &c. P. 127. ' The paſſage of theſe mighty armies ' *were* rare and perilous events.' P. 151. ' The ' four ſucceſſive *battles* of the French were com- ' manded by,' &c. So p. 153, ' The ſix *battles*

---

[1] p. 157.

'of the French formed their encampment;' and p. 155, 'he found the ſix weary diminutive *battles* 'of the French, encompaſſed by ſixty ſquadrons of 'the Greek cavalry.' Here the word *battle* is uſed in an acceptation, that is occaſionally given it by our old writers. But it is an acceptation very harſh and violent. It is thus uſed as an abbreviation for *battle-array*, and means a diviſion of an army arrayed for battle; juſt as it ſeems to be uſed for *battle-axe* in this unnoticed paſſage of the Pſalms, 'there brake he 'the arrows of the *bow*, the *ſhield*, the *ſword*, and 'the *battle*.' And as the uſe of *battle* for *battle-axe* would be very harſh in a modern writer, however countenanced by this and perhaps other paſſages in our old authors; ſo the adoption of *battle* for the diviſion of an army, however ſanctioned by a number of our old authors, is very violent. But in p. 154 we have another word derived from this ancient ſource. 'The numbers that defended the '*vantage-ground*,' meaning not a real elevation of *ground*, but the height of the ramparts, 'repulſed 'and *oppreſſed* the adventurous Latins.' And, as *oppreſſed* is very improper in military language, and ſhould be *preſſed* or *overpowered*; ſo *vantage ground* is equally improper in itſelf, and in its application. Nor can we too much wonder at the injudiciouſneſs of a writer, who could here take the momentary fancy, of ſprinkling his compleatly modern language with *any* antiquated terms of hiſtory; and of ſelecting *ſuch* only, as were obviouſly improper in their antient uſe, and are doubly improper now in his. We may ſpeak, and ſome writers have ſpoken, of the ‘ vantage *of* ground.’ But the preſent modes of elegance certainly require us, to call it the ‘ advantage of ground.’ And both elegance and uſe unite to interdict us, from talking of the ‘ vantage ground’ with Mr. Gibbon. The words *vantage ground* and *battle*, as *here uſed*, are indeed ſuch a *barbariſm* in one of them, as we ſhould never have expected in Mr. Gibbon, and ſuch a *ſolecſm* in the other, as we ſhould laugh at in any writer.

Miſquotation. Text. ‘ Pope Innocent the Third ‘ accuſes *the pilgrims* of reſpecting, in their luſt, ‘ neither age nor ſex[1].’ But the Pope, as quoted by Mr. Gibbon himſelf in the note, is by no means ſo comprehenſive and general, as Mr. Gibbon makes him. He ſpeaks not of *the pilgrims* at large. He notices only *ſome of them*. ‘ *Quidam* (ſays Innocent—) nec religioni nec ætati,’ &c. And this furniſhes another inſtance, how free or how careleſs Mr. Gibbon is in the application of his authorities. Nor does the Pope mean what Mr. Gibbon's words import when he ſpeaks even of *ſome* not ſparing either age or *ſex*. He ſays, indeed, that *theſe* ‘ nec religioni nec ætati nec *ſexui* pepercerunt.’ But his meaning is ſufficiently reſtricted, by his words immediately following; ‘ ſed fornicationes, ‘ adulteria, inceſtus in oculis omnium exercentes,’ &c. And Mr. Gibbon himſelf ſtates the fact in oppoſition to his language, to be that ‘ fornication, ‘ adultery, and inceſt were perpetrated.’ Even as to *inceſt*, the original author means no more what his tranſlator means by *inceſt,* than he does what the other ſignifies by *ſex.* The impurities were all with *women.* But the *fornications* and *adulteries* were with *widows* and with *wives.* And the *inceſt* was with *nuns.* ‘ Non ſolum maritatas et viduas, ſed ‘ et matronas et virgines Deo—dicatas, expoſue- ‘ runt,’ &c. And, as Mr. Gibbon (I fear) meant to *inſinuate* more than he dared to *avow,* ſo he has certainly fixed the viciouſneſs upon *all,* when it apparently belonged only to *ſome.*

---

[1] p. 166.

Chapter the FOURTH

or ſixty-firſt.—This ſhews us the nomination of an emperour by the Latins, 174—177; the diviſion of the provinces of the empire among them, 177—180; the provinces ſtill ſtanding out againſt them, 180—183; the diſcontent of the Greeks at Conſtantinople, 183—184; the conſpiracy of the Bulgarians with them, 184—185; the Greeks maſſacreing the Latins, 185; the approach of the Bulgarians, 185; the Latin emperour defeated and taken, 185—186; the Latin empire reduced to little more than the capital, 186—188; the ſecond Latin emperour, 188; his misfortunes, 189; his ſucceſſes, 189—191; his admiſſion of the Greeks into offices, 191; other parts of his conduct, 191—192; the third Latin emperour, a Frenchman, cruſhed with all his army in marching towards Conſtantinople, 192—194; the fourth Latin emperour equally a Frenchman, reaching Conſtantinople, 194; his misfortunes, 194—195; the fifth Latin emperour, 196—197; his ſucceſs againſt the Greeks of Nice and the King of Bulgaria, who beſieged Conſtantinople, 197; the ſixth and laſt Latin emperour, 198; his misfortunes, 198—199; his mortgaging the holy relics, 200—202; the Greek empire of Nice gaining greatly upon him, 202—203; ſurprizing Conſtantinople itſelf, 204—206; the general conſequences of the cruſades upon weſtern Europe, 206—211; and ‘a digreſſion on the family of Courtenay,’ from which ſome of the Latin emperours were derived, 211—220. This acknowledged ‘digreſſion,’ ſays Mr. Gibbon, ‘the ‘purple of three emperours, who have reigned at ‘Conſtantinople, will *authoriſe* or *excuſe*.’ Mr. Gibbon has ſo vitiated his underſtanding by the habit of indulgence, that he can no longer diſcern the groſſeſt abſurdity of digreſſion. Blinded by the blaze of the ſun which has been ſo licentiouſly gazed upon, the eye is no longer able to behold an oppoſed mountain. And the addition of a genealogical eſſay to the hiſtory of this chapter, is one of the moſt wanton and whimſical effuſions of injudiciouſneſs, that even the preſent production can furniſh. I need not ſay, that the very purport of his work, and the very profeſſions of his preface, confine him to the hiſtory of the Roman empire, reſtrain him to the hiſtory of its decline and fall, and tie him down to the moſt important circumſtances of either. There is no need of a ſingle argument, upon the point. The digreſſion ſpeaks ſufficiently, for its own intruſiveneſs and effrontery. And this moſt ridiculous of all ridiculous digreſſions, this clumſily ſtitched-on *aſſumentum* to the records of hiſtory, and this awkwardly protuberant botch upon the mantle of it; could not, even in the judgment of Mr. Gibbon, enſlaved as his judgment is by the perpetual practice of digreſſions, have been deemed capable of any excuſe, much leſs of any ſanction; if another principle had not come in to delude him. The *zeal* of Mr. Gibbon betrays his *vanity*. He has ſome real or pretended connection, we doubt not, with the family which he blazons ſo ſtudiouſly. For the ſake of gratifying this petty pride, the hiſtorian *of the world* is content to ſink into the humble annaliſt *of a family*; the purblind critic takes care to ſhut his eyes entirely; and the race-horſe, that was perpetually ſtriking out of the courſe, reſolves to quit it with a bold leap at once. And all ſerves ſtrongly to impreſs a full conviction upon our minds of the weakneſs of Mr. Gibbon's judgment, when it comes to ſtruggle with his habits, and to contend with his paſſions; and of its readineſs when it is reduced into ſervitude, to eſpouſe the cauſe of its maſters, to 'excuſe' what it would heartily condemn in its free ſtate, and even to 'authoriſe' the moſt ſavage intemperances of tyranny over it.

I have already juſtified the cruſades ſufficiently, upon principles of policy and upon grounds of probity. Nor ſhall I now examine any new intimations againſt them, in Mr. Gibbon. Only I cannot but notice the very violent zeal of Mr. Gibbon, which has incidentally charged the cruſaders with *a moſt extraordinary crime.* This is no leſs an enormity, than working,—not upon Sundays—but—in Paſſion Week. 'Such was the pious tendency of 'the cruſades,' he ſays at the ſiege of Adrianople, 'that *they employed the holy week,*' and the margin adds *March*; 'in pillaging the country for ſubſiſtence, 'and *in framing engines for the deſtruction of their* '*fellow Chriſtians*[1].'

'The empire, at once in a ſtate of childhood 'and *caducity*[2].' This is worſe than the worſt of Johnſon's *ſeſquipedalian* words. It is alſo abſurd. *Caducity* forms no contraſt to childhood. And *ſenility* ſhould have been the latinized word.

Text. 'The—poverty of Baldwin was alle'viated,—by the *alienation* of the marquiſate of 'Namur and *the lordſhip of Courtenay.*' Note. 'Louis IX. diſapproved and *ſtopped* the *alienation* 'of *Courtenay*[3].' This is very ſtrange. But we have ſeen ſo much of the ſtrangeneſs in the text and notes already, that even theſe moſt amazing of all contrarieties loſe their effect upon us, and contradictorineſs becomes familiar in Mr. Gibbon. In every other author, the text and the notes go on in loving fellowſhip together. The note indeed always plays the paraſite to the text.

---

[1] p. 186. [2] p. 187. [3] p. 199.

Quicquid dicunt, laudo; id rurſum ſi negant, laudò id quòque;
Negat quis? nego; ait? aio: poſtremò imperavi egomet mihi,
Omnia adſentari; is quæſtus nunc eſt multò uberrimus.

But Mr. Gibbon repeatedly breaks in upon this paraſitical humour, and deſtroys this loving fellowſhip. His notes are behaving like impudent varlets to their maſters, and giving them the *lie direct.* This does, we ſee, in the boldeſt manner. And yet we find 'the caſtle of Courtenay' actually *alienated* afterwards, becauſe it is ſaid to be 'profaned 'by a plebeian owner[1].' So, with an equally obvious though much leſs remarkable contradiction, Mr. Gibbon makes 'the *nummus aureus*—about *ten* 'ſhillings ſterling in value[2];' when he has previouſly made it, 'equivalent to *eight* ſhillings of our 'ſterling money[3].' Both unite with the *emboſſed* digreſſion above, to ſhew digreſſions and contradictions continuing to go on together; and to mark by their union; the natural unfixedneſs of Mr. Gibbon's ſpirit, and the habitual unſteadineſs of Mr. Gibbon's judgment.

---

[1] p. 215. [2] p. 200. [3] vol. v. 397.

Chapter the FIFTH,

and ſixty-ſecond—Here we ſee the private hiſtory of the empire of Nice, before Conſtantinople was recovered ftom the Latins, 221-222; in the conduct of the firſt and ſecond emperors, 222-224; in that of the third, 224-225; in that of the guardians of the fourth, 226-231; and in that of the fifth to the taking of Conſtantinople, 231-232. So much of the chapter is all digreſſional. ‘In the ‘decline of the Latins,’ ſays Mr. Gibbon, ‘I have ‘briefly expoſed the progreſs of the Greeks; the ‘prudent and gradual advances of a conqueror, ‘who, in a reign of thirty-three years, reſcued the ‘provinces from national and foreign uſurpers, till ‘he preſſed on all ſides the imperial city, a leafleſs ‘and ſapleſs trunk which muſt fall at the firſt ‘ſtroke of the axe. But *his* interior and peaceable ‘adminiſtration is ſtill more deſerving of notice ‘and praiſe [1].’ He therefore purſues the ſubject. He thus digreſſes widely from the hiſtory of the ‘decline and fall’ of the Roman empire, more widely from the ‘important’ circumſtances of either, and ſtill more widely from ‘the moſt important.’ But his digreſſion does not conſiſt merely, in executing what he ſo digreſſionally propoſes. The ‘interior and peaceable adminiſtration,’ in his amplifying hands, becomes a hiſtory. And it is not the hiſtory merely, of the conquerour here alluded to: it is the hiſtory of his ſon, of his ſon's ſon, &c. Thus does one digreſſion come riding upon the back of another,

---

[1] P. 222.

Velut unda ſupervenit undam.

The chapter then goes on to ſhew us the entrance, of the guardian of the Greek emperour into Conſtantinople, 232-233; his conduct towards it, 233-234; his depoſing and blinding the young emperour, 234; the diſcontents of the clergy at this, 235-237; his recovering ſome provinces of the empire from the Latins, 237-238; his attempting to unite the eaſtern and the weſtern church, in vain, 238-242; the King of Naples and Sicily being formidable to the Greek emperour, 243; his hiſtory, 243-244; his deſigns againſt the emperour, 245; prevented by a rebellion, &c. in his own dominions, 245-248; ſome of the troops that had been fighting in Sicily taken into the emperour's pay, 248-250; their ſucceſſes againſt the Turks, 250; their diſorderly behaviour to the ſubjects of the empire, 250; their inſolence to the emperour, 250-251; their defeating the troops of the empire, 251-252; their ſeizing Athens and Greece, 253-254; and the preſent ſtate of Athens, 255-256. Here we have ſome very extraordinary digreſſions. Such is the account of attempting to unite the eaſtern and weſtern churches, by reducing the faith of the eaſtern to the creed of the weſtern, and by ſubjecting both to the ſupremacy of the pope. It is purely a point of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory. It has no relation to the civil hiſtory of the empire. It has leſs, if poſſible, to the hiſtory of its decline and fall. And it has, if poſſible, ſtill leſs to a narration of the important circumſtances in them. We were told before, as an excuſe for entering into a long labyrinth of theology; that 'the ſchiſm of Conſtantinople, by alienating 'her moſt uſeful allies, and provoking her moſt 'dangerous enemies, has precipitated the decline 'and fall of the Roman empire in the Eaſt[1].' We then ſaw theſe allies and theſe enemies, reducing Conſtantinople, and giving ſeveral emperours to it. Here then, of courſe, terminated for the reign of the Latins, this ſeparation of the two churches. But, it ſeems, this ſeparation was not cured, even by the Latins. So little was the union an object of the Latin attempt, that it was never made though they ſucceeded. Accordingly we find the *Genoeſe* afterwards forming an alliance with the Greek emperours of Nice; againſt their Latin brethren of Conſtantinople[2]. Even afterwards we hear, that 'the reign of the Latins *confirmed the ſeparation* of the two churches[3].' And we ſee that ſeparation now attempted, ſeriouſly and formally, to be taken away. So utterly inſignificant, even from Mr. Gibbon's *own* narration, does the union or the ſeparation of the churches appear, as a civil incident! So utterly indefenſible, even from his *own* ſtate of facts, is Mr. Gibbon's long excurſion before into the regions of his own romantic divinity! And ſo wildly wanton again does his preſent digreſſion appear, upon the face of his *own* hiſtory! But he cloſes the chapter with a digreſſion, ſtill more wildly wanton than this. The hiſtorian aſſumes the traveller. He leaps out of the orbit of hiſtory. He lights upon the ground of Athens. He thus exceeds the ſpirit, of concluding his laſt chapter with the genealogy of the houſe of Courtenay. And he concludes his preſent, with deſcribing the ſtate of Athens *as it is at this moment.* He has thus formed a digreſſion, that overtops all his former, that recoils with a compleater energy from the courſe of his hiſtory, and wanders more gloriouſly aſtray from the path of propriety.

---

[1] p. 121. [2] p. 203. [3] p. 207.

'The cauſe was decided, *according to the new juriſprudence of the Latins*, by ſingle combat[1].' This is very injudiciouſly aſſerted. The cauſe was tried and the combat undertaken, not at Conſtantinople after the re-eſtabliſhment of the empire at its antient capital, but even while it yet continued at Nice. In ſuch a ſtate of the empire, and in a ſituation of continual warfare with the Latins of Conſtantinople, it is abſolutely impoſſible for the juriſprudence to be borrowed from the Latins. It was undoubtedly a part of the antient and original juriſprudence of the Greeks. Accordingly we ſee the *fiery ordeal* in Mr. Gibbon himſelf, equally uſed at the ſame time and in the ſame place by the Greeks[2]. And we even ſee both in another page of Mr. Gibbon, aboliſhed by the ſame Greeks at the ſame place, and ſtill *before* the recovery of the old capital from the Latins[1]. Both reſulted aſſuredly from the judiciary proceedings of the earlieſt ages. The *waters of jealouſy* among the Jews, carry the principle to a very remote antiquity. The cuſtom of the Germans upon the Rhine, even ſo late as the days of Julian, in trying the chaſtity of their wives by throwing their children into the river; has a near affinity with the Jewiſh mode of purgation, and a ſtill nearer with the water-ordeal of our own country. Theſe ſerve ſufficiently to ſhew at once, the antiquity and the extenſiveneſs of theſe judiciary kinds of divination. The Greeks would be ſure to have them, as well as the Jews. And the two incidents here noticed by Mr. Gibbon, ſhew evidently that they had them.

---

[1] p. 225.

[2] p. 226—227.

'By the *Latins* the lord of Thebes was ſtyled *by* '*corruption Megas Kurios* or *Grand Sire*[2].' This is a perfect riddle. In what country would the *Latins* call the Latin lord of Thebes, by a *Greek* title? Or, if they did, in what country may we pronounce this a *corruption?* And in what country will *grandſire* ſtand, for a tranſlation of μεγας κυριος?

Dic quibus in terris, et eris mihi magnus Apollo,

'It would not be eaſy,' he ſays concerning the *preſent* Athens, 'in the country of Plato and De'moſthenes, to find a reader, or a copy, of their 'works[3].' This is ſatire overcharged. The pre-

---

[1] p. 229. [2] p. 253. [3] p. 256.

ſent Athenians are *not* ſo inattentive to the writings of their forefathers. The late Mr. Wood tells us in his Eſſay on Homer, as we remember, that he read Homer with a Greek ſchoolmaſter at Athens.

‘ The factious nobles were reduced or oppreſſed ‘ by the *aſcendant* of his genius ’.[*] For *aſcendant* read noſtro periculo *aſcendancy*.

Chapter the SIXTH,

or ſixty-third.——This contains the diſputes of the emperour with the patriarch, 257-259, certainly *no* circumſtance of the decline and fall of the empire; the character of John Cantacuzenus as an hiſtorian, 259-260, a point improper in the text of *any* hiſtory, and peculiarly ſo in the text of this; diſputes of the emperour with his grandſon, 260-262; the grandſon breaking out into rebellion, 262-263; forcing the emperour to abdicate, 264-265; his own reign, 265-267; his young ſon's guardian, 267-268; the guardian ill-treated, 268-270; breaking out into rebellion, but defeated, 270-271; ſtill maintaining the rebellion, 272; at laſt victorious, 272-275; the young emperour ſoon taking up arms againſt him, 275-276; the guardian again victorious and now ſeizing the throne, 277; driven from it by a revolt in favour of the young emperour, 277-278; an account of the divine light of Mount Thabor, 278-280, an amazing digreſſion, being a diſſertation on ſome wild notion of the Quietiſts, and introduced merely from the dethroned guardian writing a book concerning it; the ſtate of the Genoeſe ſettled cloſe to Conſtantinople, 280-283; their breaking out into ſucceſsful rebellion, 283-285; the Venetian fleet called in to the aid of the empire, 285; and the Genoeſe beating the fleets of both, 286-287. In this chapter, allowing all the other articles to be circumſtances in the hiſtory of the decline and fall of the empire, important circumſtances, and very important too; yet we have no leſs than three apparently digreſſional. The laſt of theſe indeed is ſo groſsly digreſſional, that it ſerves with others preceding, to ſhew the author totally void even of all critical decency. Nor can I too much expoſe this bold immodeſty of writing, becauſe it is little noticed by the herd of critics; becauſe it is deſtructive of all regularity in compoſition and forms a kind of Gothic edifice, a maſs of parts, but no whole. And the author was ſeduced into the laſt digreſſion, by the un-reſiſting feebleneſs of a judgment that has ſo long given way; and by a ſtrange fondneſs in his ſpirit, for prancing over the fields of theology, ſhewing the lightneſs of his heels in the giddineſs of his motions, and betraying the ignorance of his inexperience in the wanton mettle of his blood.

---

[*] P. 229.

'Nor were the flames of hell *leſs* dreadful to his 'fancy, than thoſe of a Catalan or Turkiſh war[1].' When I firſt read this ſentence, I ſuppoſed the printer had ſubſtituted *leſs* by miſtake for *more*. So muſt any man have written, who believed the exiſtence of hell. But Mr. Gibbon, we fear for *his* ſake, does not. This paſſage ſhews too plainly, he does not. And thus, with a bold defiance of the common ſenſe and common feelings of mankind, he makes the terrors of eternity, of which every good and every wiſe man muſt think with the deepeſt awe; to be *leſs* formidable in themſelves, than—a hoſt of Catalans or an army of Turks.

---

[1] P. 257.

Note. 'The ingenious compariſon with Moſes 'and Cæſar, is *fancied* by his French tranſlator[1].' What this means we *gueſs* as we read it. But we ſoon find that we gueſſed wrong. 'It is obſerved' of Cantacuzenus, ſays Mr. Gibbon a few lines lower in the text, than the place referred to in the note; 'that, like Moſes and Cæſar, he was the principal 'actor in the ſcenes which he deſcribes.' And we now ſee, that when Mr. Gibbon ſays this compariſon was *fancied*, he means it was *ſuggeſted by the fancy*.——'The *vaſt* ſilence of the palace[2].' We thus find that *boyiſm*, which Mr. Gibbon has borrowed from Tacitus, affronting our taſte again.——'She was *regenerated* and crowned in St. Sophia[3].' He means *re-baptiſed*.——'His vigorous govern'ment *contained* the Genoeſe of Galata within thoſe 'limits[4].' Here the uſe of the word *contained*, is more Latin than Engliſh.

Chapter SEVENTH

and ſixty-fourth.——The contents of this are, the general conqueſts of the Mogul Tartars under Zingis,

---

[1] p. 259.

[2] p. 264.

[3] p. 267.

[4] p. 281.

gis, 289-290; his code of laws, 290-292; his particular conqueſts in China, 292-294; in Carizme, Tranſoxiana, Perſia, and ſome independent parts of Tartary, 294-296; the conqueſts of his four firſt ſucceſſors in China, 297-299; in the countries adjoining to China, 299; in Perſia, 299-300; in Armenia, Anatolia, &c. 300-301; in Kipzak, Ruſſia, Poland, Hungary, &c. 301-304; and in Siberia, 304-305; the change of manners in the Tartar emperours upon this ſucceſs, 305-306; the Tartars in China adopting the manners of the Chineſe, 306-307; yet expelled by the Chineſe, 307; the other conqueſts becoming independent of the emperours, 307; many becoming Mahometans, 307-308; *the eſcape of the Roman empire from their arms*, 308-310; and the decline of their power, 310. All this is evidently a chain of continued digreſſions. There is only one article out of ſeventeen, that has any connection even with the *full* hiſtory of the empire. The hiſtory of the *decline* and *fall* of the empire, has no more connection with it, than a hiſtory of the revolutions in the moon, or of the phyſical convulſions in our globe. Mr. Gibbon himſelf acknowledges, that it has not; in the noticed *eſcape* of the Roman empire from the Tartar arms. *This* therefore is the only point of the long narrative, that ought, in juſtice to his plan and his promiſes, to have been noticed at all. Yet under his conduct the Tartars, like Cato, enter the theatre, and *then*—go out again. He brings them upon the ſtage, as Homer brings half his heroes, merely to be knocked upon the head. And at the cloſe of the whole we are told, after the Tartars had proved totally *innoxious* to the Roman empire; that 'the '*decline* of the *Moguls* gave a free ſcope to the *riſe* 'and *progreſs* of the *Ottoman empire.*' He thus erects the empire of the Tartars, to ſweep it away with a bruſh of his hand, and to raiſe the empire of the Ottomans upon the ground; and two-and-twenty pages are employed, when two would have been too many. The chapter then goes on to the origin of the Ottoman Turks, 310-311; the ſucceſſes of their founder Othman againſt the empire, 311-312; the ſucceſſes of his ſon Orchan againſt it, 312-315; the firſt paſſage of the Turks into Europe, 315-316; Orchan's marriage with a daughter of the Roman emperour, 316-317; the eſtabliſhment of the Ottomans in Europe, 318-319; their making Adrianople their capital there, 319; their reduction of Bulgaria, &c. 319-320; their appointment of the Janizaries, 320-321; their reduction of Macedonia, Theſſaly, and Greece, 322; the character of the conqueror, 322-323; his invaſion of Hungary, 323; his defeat of the Hungarians and French, 323-325; his conduct of his French captives, 325-327; the diſſentions among the Greeks, 327-329; the diſtreſs of the empire, 329; Conſtantinople beſieged by the Turks, 329; relieved by a fleet of French, 329-330; again beſieged by the Turks, and again relieved accidentally by Tamerlane, 330. Thus, more than half of the whole chapter, is entirely foreign to it. Yet, in this very chapter, Mr. Gibbon can ſpeak of the hiſtory of Chalcondyles, as one 'whoſe proper ſubject is 'drowned in a ſea of epiſode.' So keen is Mr. Gibbon to diſcern the faults of another, and ſo blind to the view of his own, even when he is juſt come from the particular commiſſion of them. We are not acquainted with the hiſtory of Chalcondyles. But no words can more appoſitely picture forth Mr. Gibbon's. *His* 'proper ſubject is' actually 'drowned in a ſea of epiſode.' And he has daſhed off his own character very happily, in that of the other. 'I have long ſince aſſerted my claim,' he ſays on preparing to wander away with the Tartars above, 'to introduce the nations, the immediate 'or remote authors of the fall of the Roman empire; nor can I refuſe myſelf to thoſe events,' the conqueſts of the Tartars, 'which, from their 'uncommon magnitude, will intereſt a philoſophic 'mind in the hiſtory of blood[1].' This is Mr. Gibbon's apology, for rambling over half the globe with the Tartars. He ſuſpected he was going to be devious, and thought to deceive himſelf and his reader by an apology. The eye of the mole can juſt diſcern light enough, to know he is expoſing himſelf to the danger of being ſeen. But he inſtantly dives, to avoid his danger. And Mr. Gibbon ſees, excuſes, and runs into it. He has long 'aſſerted his claim to introduce the nations, the immediate or the remote authors of the fall of the 'Roman empire.' He *therefore* 'introduces a nation,' that, *by his own account*, was not 'the *immediate*,' was not even 'the *remote*, *author* of the

---

[1] p. 288.

'*fall.*' This is a glaring proof of Mr. Gibbon's powers of reaſoning. '*Nor can I refuſe myſelf,*' he adds, 'to thoſe events,' not as in the chain of thought and of propriety he *ought* to have ſaid, which relate to ſome ſpecial 'authors of the fall;' but 'which, *from their uncommon magnitude*, will *intereſt a philoſophic mind* in the hiſtory of blood.' Mr. Gibbon evidently ſaw the abſurdity of his digreſſion, but 'could not refuſe himſelf' to it. The paroxyſm of rambling was upon him, and he could not reſiſt it. His mind is ever ready to catch at any 'events of uncommon magnitude,' however foreign they may be to his plan, and however contrary to his promiſe. It was ſo, at his outſet in the hiſtory.. It is now a thouſand times more ſo, from his long habits of digreſſion. And, from both, unable to withſtand the temptation, yet ſenſible it was a temptation, he throws the duſt of an apology in his own eyes and the reader's; but wilfully turns off in it from his natural courſe of ideas, which would have led the reader and him to detect the *falſeneſs* of the apology. Inſtead of repreſenting the Tartars, as 'authors' *in any degree* 'of the fall of the Roman 'empire;' he repreſents their tranſactions as events, that 'will intereſt a philoſophic mind in the hiſtory 'of blood.' He thus acknowledges, very plainly, the *epiſodical* nature of his Tartar hiſtory here; by deſerting the ground of juſtification, which he had taken firſt, and on which alone it could be juſtified; and turning off to a ground, upon which he might juſtify the hiſtory of *any* active nation, or the account of *any* turbulent empire, upon the face of the earth.

Contradictions. Text. 'The Khan of the Keraites, who, under the name of Preſter John, *had correſponded* with the Roman pontiff and the princes of Europe,' &c. Note: 'The Khans of the Keraites were moſt probably *incapable* of *reading* the pompous epiſtles *compoſed* in *their* name by *the Neſtorian miſſionaries*[1].'——Text. 'In the attack and defence of places' by the Chineſe and Tartars, '—the uſe of *gunpowder* in *cannon* and *bombs* appears as *a familiar practice*[2].' Note. 'I depend on the knowledge and fidelity of the Pere Gaubil, who tranſlates the *Chineſe text* of the *annals* of the Moguls or Yuen (p. 71, 93, 153).' So far the note goes hand in hand with the text. *Then* a ſlight doubt concerning the *veracity* of the text, intrudes upon us: 'but I am ignorant, *at what time* theſe annals were *compoſed* and *publiſhed*.' Yet, upon the credit of theſe very annals, Mr. Gibbon has aſſerted the uſe of gunpowder, to have been 'a familiar practice' at *that* particular time. He then advances into higher than doubts. He brings a ſtrong argument of preſumption, *againſt* both *their* veracity and *his own*. 'The two uncles of Marco Polo, who ſerved as engineers at the ſiege of Siengyangfou (l. ii. c. 61. in Ramuſio, tom. ii. See Gaubil, p. 155-157), *muſt* have *felt* and *related* the *effects* of *this deſtructive powder*; and their *ſilence* is a *weighty*, and *almoſt deciſive*, objection.' Mr. Gibbon has thus brought an objection 'weighty, and almoſt deciſive,' againſt the

---

[1] p. 289—290.

[2] p. 298.

truth of *his own* aſſertion. And he arraigns *himſelf* and his *text* of *falſhood*, at the bar of his notes.

Chapter EIGHTH

or ſixty-fifth.——This contains the private hiſtory of Tamerlane to his gaining the royalty of Tranſoxiana, 331-335, all digreſſional; his conqueſts in Perſia, 335-336, equally digreſſional; his reduction of Ormuz, Bagdad, Edeſſa, and Georgia, 336-337, equally digreſſional; his ſucceſſes in Turkeſtan, Kipzak, and Ruſſia, 338-339, equally digreſſional; his reduction of Azoph, Serai, and Aſtrachan, 338-339, equally digreſſional; his conqueſts in India, 339-341, equally digreſſional; angry letters between him and the Turkiſh emperour, 342-345, equally digreſſional; his invaſion of Syria, now poſſeſſed by the Mamalukes of Egypt, 345-347, equally digreſſional; his march into the Turkiſh dominions, 348-349; his defeat of the Turks, 349-351; his reduction of all their dominions in Aſia, 351-352; his reception of the Turkiſh emperour, 352-353, again digreſſional; the ſtory of his putting him in an iron cage examined, 353-356, equally digreſſional; his making the Roman emperour ſwear to pay him the ſame tribute, which had been paid to the Turks, 357; his ſucceſſes againſt other powers, 359, again digreſſional; his triumph and feſtivity after all, 359-360, equally digreſſional; his preparations for invading China, 360, equally digreſſional; his death baffling his deſigns, 360-361, equally digreſſional; his character examined and his merits aſcertained, 361-364, equally digreſſional;

ſional; the hiſtory of the Turks after Bajazet's defeat, 364-367, equally digreſſional; the Genoeſe aſſiſting the Turks of Aſia to reduce the Turks of Europe, 367-368, equally digreſſional; the ſtate of the Roman empire, 369; the emperour offending both the rival kings of the Turks, 370-371; Conſtantinople beſieged by the victorious rival, but beating him off, 371; the emperour ſubmitting to pay a tribute as before, and to relinquiſh almoſt all the country without the ſuburbs of the city, 371; the hereditary ſucceſſion of the royalty among the Turks, 372-373, again digreſſional; the education and diſcipline of the Turks, 373-375, equally digreſſional; and an eſſay on the invention and uſe of gunpowder, as practiſed in the late ſiege of Conſtantinople, 375-377. Thus, out of twenty-ſeven articles, no leſs than nineteen are merely digreſſional; having only a *general* connexion with the *full* hiſtory of the empire, having none at all with the hiſtory of its *decline* and *fall*, and having leſs than none (if poſſible) with the *important* circumſtances of either. But Mr. Gibbon catches at the ſlighteſt thread that is floating in the air, in order to waft himſelf along in queſt of his prey. If the Turks be *foes* to the empire, he will give us circumſtantial accounts of the Turks. If the Tartars of Tamerlane be *foes* to the *foes* of the empire, he will be equally circumſtantial concerning the Tartars. And inſtead of a really *general* account, that ſhall juſt *ſketch* out their hiſtory to the period of their connection with the empire, and then dwell upon it particularly; he gives us *his* general hiſtory, replete with *particular* anecdotes, and ſpreading through a *variety* of pages; and is as circumſtantial *before* the connection, as *after* it. We have ſeen this, in the hiſtory of Zingis and his Tartars before; though their tranſactions had only a *negative* connection with the empire, and the account of them concludes with their *not* affecting the empire at all. We here ſee it again, in the hiſtory of Tamerlane and his Tartars: where the only *ſpiders thread* of connection is, that they advanced to the Helleſpont, after having reduced the Turks in Aſia; and made the emperour vow the homage, and promiſe the tribute, which he had paid to the Turks before. Yet *that* is twenty pages in quarto, and *this* ſixteen. Thus, becauſe the dread of Zingis prevented the *Swedes* and *Frizelanders*, from going to the herring-fiſhery of England; and the *Engliſh*, having all the fiſhery to themſelves, lowered the price conſiderably in all the markets of England: from this almoſt inviſible filament of air, if he was writing the hiſtory of England, he would think himſelf juſtified, in giving us his circumſtantial abſtract of the tranſactions of Zingis, even in ſuch a hiſtory. No fence can ſerve to keep in this ſkipping deer. And his whole hiſtory ſtrongly reminds us of the iſland at Rome, which has two bridges to it, and a church and a monaſtery upon it; and yet was formed originally, of Tarquin's *ſheaves of corn.* The hiſtory of the decline and fall of the Roman empire, is thus formed by accretions and deterrations, from the full hiſtory of the empire, and from almoſt every other hiſtory in the world. Nor has the author the diſcretion in digreſſing, to keep off all ſubordinate and acceſſary digreſſions. He indulges himſelf in the full and free licence of digreſſions *upon* digreſſions. When he has led Tamerlane by the hand, to the defeat of the Turks; he muſt ſuperadd to his general digreſſion, a particular one by the way, in a diſſertation about the iron cage of Bajazet. Nor has he even the prudence, when he has brought down this *ſide-hiſtory* to that point of his own, *for which* he wrote it; there to terminate all his digreſſions, to leave the bye-road by which he had been rounding about to the main one, and now to purſue the main road ſteadily for a while. No! He ſtrikes directly acroſs the main road again, and diverges from it on the other ſide. And when he has made Tamerlane, after all his conqueſts, to reduce the empire into the ſame ſubmiſſion and tribute, which it had paid the Turks; he does not then cloſe his divarications with Tamerlane, as we expect even the moſt impertinent of digreſſors to do, becauſe he has reached the grand goal of all his digreſſions. He goes on in his excurſions, to give us Tamerlane's ſucceſſes againſt other powers, to paint his triumph and feſtivity after all, nay to tell us his preparations for invading China, to baffle them by his death, even then to examine his character formally, and to aſcertain his merits preciſely. Mr. Gibbon muſt thus appear, with every allowance that can be made him, and with every ſobriety that can be uſed in conſidering his conduct; the moſt aſtoniſhing digreſſor that ever pretended to write hiſtory; even when he has ſome little ſemblance of connection, between his hiſtory and his digreſſions.

Mr. Gibbon has *gravely* adopted a wild ſtroke of Oriental bombaſt, *as his own*: 'whole foreſts were 'cut down to ſupply fuel for his kitchens[1],' at a *particular* feaſt.

Contradictions. Text. 'It is *believed* in the em'pire and *family* of Timour, that the *monarch* him'ſelf *compoſed*—the *inſtitutions* of his government[2].' Note. 'Shaw Allum, the preſent mogul, *reads*, '*values*, but *cannot imitate*, the *inſtitutions* of *his* '*great anceſtor*.' The text aſſerts the exiſtence of Tamerlane's *inſtitutions*, only as an object of *belief*. The note indirectly contradicts the text, by mounting much higher in the ſcale of aſſurance, and turning belief into *certainty*. Shaw Allum actually 'reads,' actually 'values,' this work 'of his 'great anceſtor' Tamerlane. Yet we have ſtill doubts thrown out immediately, as if Shaw Allum was not ſo good a judge as Mr. Gibbon, what is really the compoſition 'of his great anceſtor.' 'The 'Engliſh tranſlator,' as the note adds, '*relies on* '*their internal evidence*; but, *if any ſuſpicions ſhould* '*ariſe of fraud and fiction*, they will *not be diſpelled* 'by Major Davy's letter. *The Orientals have never*

---

[1] p. 359.

[2] p. 332.

'*cultivated the art of criticiſm.*' Thus, what is noticed in the text as only *believed*, is then aſſerted in the beginning of the note to be *certain*, and is left at laſt *doubtful*. And, after all, Mr. Gibbon repeatedly refers to the work as *not* doubtful, as *more* than believed, as certain *again*. The judgement of a ſceptick, may become ſo vitiated and debilitated by the exerciſe of ſcepticiſm, I ſuppoſe; as not to ſettle peremptorily upon any point, to fluctuate between certainty and doubt on the plaineſt, and to be ſometimes doubtful, ſometimes certain, and yet doubtful ſtill. Scepticiſm is thus to the mind, what opium is to the body; an enlivener of the ſpirits, and an illuminator of the underſtanding, in a very moderate degree; but dangerous in the uſe, and fatal in the exceſs; enfeebling the nerves of the ſoul, deſtroying the tone of the thoughts, and reducing the unhappy man into a drunken paralytick in intellect.

Text. 'Timour ſtood firm as a rock[1].' Note ſays, that Arabſhah makes Timour *run away*: and adds concerning the very author, from whom he has aſſerted Timour to ſtand firm as a rock; 'perhaps Sherefeddin (l. iii. c. 25) has *magnified* 'his *courage*.' He therefore, *perhaps*, did *not* 'ſtand 'firm as a rock,' though the text aſſerts poſitively that he *did*. Text. 'The Mogul ſoldiers were en-'riched with an immenſe ſpoil of precious furs, *of* '*the linen of Antioch*, and *of ingots of gold and ſil-*

---

[1] p. 336.

'*ver*[1].' Note. 'The *furs* of Ruſſia are *more* cre'dible than the *ingots*;' when both are repreſented above to be *certain*. 'But *the linen of Antioch* has '*never* been famous; and *Antioch was in ruins*.' The *text* therefore *ſpeaks falſely*. 'I ſuſpect,' he adds, 'that it was ſome manufacture of Europe, 'which the Hanſe merchants had imported by the 'way of Novogorod.' Yet he expreſsly calls it the linen of *Antioch*. And what muſt be the intoxication and palſy of a mind, from the opium of ſcepticiſm; that can thus give *itſelf* the lie, in one breath aver a point boldly and confidently, and in the very next find ſufficient reaſon to reprobate its own averment?

Chapter the NINTH,

or ſixty-ſixth.——We have here a detail of the Greek emperours, applying for relief to the Weſt, and offering to unite the eaſtern and weſtern churches, 378-384; the perſonal viſit of one of them, for the ſame relief and with the ſame offer, 385-387; that of another for relief only, 387-390; the deſcriptions of Germany, France, and England, as given by the attendants of theſe emperours, 390-393; application again for relief with the old offer, 394-395; the ſtate of the imperial family, 395-397; the corruptions of the Latin church, 397-398; the ſchiſm in the Weſt from the coexiſtence of two popes, 398; the councils of Piſa and Conſtance, 398; the council of Baſil, 399-400; this council inviting the emperour and his patriarch to come to it, 400; his embaſſadours received honourably by it, 400; the council and pope being at variance, the place of meeting fixed by the pope's management to be at Ferrara, 400-401; both fitting out gallies for fetching the emperour, but the pope's taking him on board, 400-402; the emperour's train, 402-404; his arrival at Venice, 404-405; his arrival at Ferrara, 405; the form of the council there, 405-406; the council adjourned, 406; the emperour ſtaying in Italy, 406-407; the council re-aſſembled at Florence, 407; the debates in it on the points of union between the churches, 407-410; the points ſettled, 410-414; the ſtate of the Greek language at Conſtantinople, 414-416; the Greeks and Latins compared in learning, 416-417; the Greek learning revived in Italy, 417-418; the ſtudies of Barlaam there, 418-419; thoſe of Petrarch, 419-420; thoſe of Boccace, 421-422; the knowledge of the Greek language ſettled in Italy, 423-424; a ſucceſſion of Grecians teaching Greek there, 425-426; their faults and their merits, 426-427; the ſtudy of the Platonic philoſophy, 427-428; the emulation and progreſs of the Latins, 429-431; and the uſe and abuſe of antient learning, 431-433. We have thus a ſtrange ſet of articles, forming the ſubſtance of this chapter. The applications of the emperours for relief, and their endeavours to back their applications by offers of uniting the churches, might perhaps be properly noticed; as evidences of the felt and acknowledged debility, to which the eaſtern empire was now reduced. But, as they terminated in no relief, they ſhould have been noticed only in a ſlight manner. Two or three pages would have been ſufficient, when *ſix-and-thirty* are employed. But Mr. Gibbon has ſuch a *loquaciouſneſs* in writing, hat he muſt talk on when he has got upon a ſubect. Nothing can ſtop the torrent of indiſcretion.

---

[1] p. 338—339.

Labitur, et labetur, in omne volubilis ævum.

Beginning thus with the application enforced by the offer, he turns aſide with the offer, goes on to the corruptions of the Latin church, the anti-popes in it, the councils, &c. &c. &c. And he dwells upon all theſe digreſſional points, with the ſame amplitude of deſcription and the ſame circumſtantiality of incident, as if the whole formed a very important part in the decline and fall of the empire. He is as much at home in every the moſt diſtant digreſſion, as he is in the regular line of his ſubject; and

Then he will talk, good gods! how he will talk!

equally upon a point that has only the ſlighteſt relation to his hiſtory, or even upon one that has none at all, as upon one that has the cloſeſt connection with it. In the *leaſt* excurſive of his digreſſions, he will make a ſlight and almoſt imperceptible point, the central pin of a large formation; juſt as a ſingle grain of ſand becomes the *nucleus* to an ample ſtone, in the human body. We ſee this in the long detail of the preſent chapter, concerning the union of the churches. But, in others of his excurſions, he ſcorns even this ‘ diſcretion in ‘ running mad.’ He aſks for no central pin. He rolls round no *nucleus*. But he *paſtes on* his matter at once. We have ſeen this exemplified ſeveral times before. And here we ſee it again, in the deſcription of Germany, France, and England, given by the attendants of the emperours. ‘ It ‘ may be *amuſing* enough,’ we are told ‘ *perhaps* ‘ inſtructive, to contemplate the rude pictures of ‘ Germany, France, and England, whoſe ancient ‘ and modern ſtate are ſo familiar to our minds[1].’ We are thus to be *amuſed*, at the expence of every propriety. We are ‘ perhaps’ to be ‘ inſtructed,’ by the violation of every decency. And, after all, this epiſode is nearly as petty as it is impertinent. But Mr. Gibbon, in modelling his hiſtory, is like an engineer conſtructing one of our navigable canals. He endeavours to draw every lively brook in the neighbourhood, into his own capacious reſervoir. Like a wild one therefore, he turns, and twiſts, and doubles the line of his canal, in queſt of it. And in ſome point of his courſe, where he ſees a fine quantity of water, he commits every violence upon nature, in raiſing vallies, in ſinking mountains, and in toſſing up a whole river by the aid of machinery, that he may have the uſe of it. Mr. Gibbon having finiſhed his *eccleſiaſtical* hiſtory, goes on to what is equally impertinent with his *Grecian* deſcription of England, France, and Germany; to the revival of the antient learning of the Greeks, in the weſt of Europe. This he purſues, through a train of eighteen or nineteen quarto pages; and in little diſſertations, on the ſtate of the Greek language at Conſtantinople, on the Greeks and Latins compared for learning, on the revival of the Greek literature in Italy, on the ſtudies of Barlaam, Petrarch, and Boccace there, &c. &c. &c. Such digreſſions as theſe ſtare ſo full in the face of criticiſm, that I hardly know at which I ſhould wonder moſt, the aſtoniſhing *monſtroſity* of them, or the eaſy acquieſcence of the publick under them. There never was, I believe, a hiſtory written ſince the creation of the world, ſo monſtrouſly digreſſional as this. And I cannot refrain from declaring, that nothing, but ſome wild extravagance of underſtanding in Mr. Gibbon, could have generated ſo many monſters of digreſſions as theſe.

---

[1] p. 391.

Chapter TENTH

or ſixty-ſeventh.——This gives us a general account of Conſtantinople at this period, 434—437; the oppoſition in the Greek church to the union ſettled with the Latin, 437—440; the reign of Amurath the Second emperor of the Turks, 440—443; the Poles and Hungarians engaging in war againſt the Turks, 443—445; their ſucceſſes, 445—447; their ſwearing to a peace, a peace, breaking their oath, and renewing the war, 447—448; their defeat, 448—451; the family, life, and death of him who perſuaded the perjury, 451—452; the family of him who commanded the army, his life to his defeat; his life afterwards, and his ſon's, 452—454; the birth and education of Scanderbeg, 454—456; his revolt from the Turks, 456—457; his valour, 457—458; his death, 458—459; the acceſſion of Conſtantine, the laſt of the emperours, to the throne of the empire, 459—460; the embaſſies of Phranza for him, 460—462; and the ſtate of the Byzantine court, 462—463. This ſhort chapter of not more than thirty pages, is full of digreſſions. Mr. Gibbon is ſo much in the habit of digreſſing, that he cannot reſiſt the temptation. And the naturally ſlender ſhape of his hiſtory, requires to be ſtuffed out with wadding and wool to the bulk wanted. The account of the oppoſition to the union in the Greeks, is juſt as digreſſional; as the narrative of the union before. It has no relation to the hiſtory. It haſtened not the fall, before it was accompliſhed. It delayed not the fall, afterwards. It has no influence upon the civil hiſtory at all. Not a pin or a wheel in the political machine, is affected by it. But Mr. Gibbon proceeds to ſtill worſer digreſſions. He gives us the hiſtory of the Poles and Hungarians, in their wars with the Turks. He adds the hiſtory of Scanderbeg, in his revolt from the Turks, and in his wars with them. He dwells upon both, with all the circumſtantiality of particular hiſtory. And he ſuperadds to the former, an account of the family, life, and death of him, who perſuaded the Poles and Hungarians to renew the war; of the family of him, who commanded their army in the preſent and the former war; of his life to his defeat, even of his life afterwards, and even of his ſon's too. Yet, in both theſe wars, how is the decline and fall of the empire concerned? The Poliſh and Hungarian wars, we are expreſsly told, the emperour 'ſeems to have 'promoted by his wiſhes, and injured by his fears[1].' *During* theſe, he 'engaged to guard the Boſphorus[2];' but, 'according to ſome writers,—had been awed 'or ſeduced to grant the paſſage[3].' This was all his concern in the buſineſs. If this could make it proper to ſhew the debility of the empire, in its being 'awed or ſeduced' to break its own ſtipulation in the alliance; then the war ſhould have been noticed ſlightly, in proportion to the ſlight concern of the empire in it. But indeed it ſhould *not* have been noticed at all. It was *not* one of the 'important' circumſtances, in the decline and fall of the empire. It was ſtill leſs one of 'the *moſt* important.' And none *but theſe* were to be noticed. Mr. Gibbon however advances an argument, for mentioning the wars of Scanderbeg, and of the Poles and Hungarians united; that 'they are both 'entitled to our notice, *ſince* their occupation of the 'Ottoman arms *delayed* the ruin of the Greek empire[4].' 'Entitled to our *notice*' they may be. But are they to a particular and circumſtantial deſcription? *This* he *gives*, though he *talks* only of *that*. Yet theſe wars, it is alleged, diverted the arms of the Turks and delayed the ruin of the empire. On the *ſame* principle however, he might notice; and even deſcribe, *every* war in which the Turks were engaged, *every* negociation in which they were concerned, *every* commotion among their people, and even *every* fever, or *every* pleaſure, which detained their ſovereign from war. And accordingly Mr. Gibbon deſcribes to us in this very chapter, the reign of Amurath the Second emperour of the Turks, *becauſe* he did *not* attack Conſtantinople, during the abſence of the emperour in the Weſt; when this very point had been noticed in p. 402 before, when it is merely *negative*, and when he might *as* juſtly have given us the hiſtory of *all* the ſurrounding nations. But digreſſions produce digreſſions. Reſigning himſelf up to the inviting hiſtories of Scanderbeg's and the Hungarian wars, he feels himſelf allured ſtill farther. The more he deſcends from the natural road, at the top of the precipice; he feels it the more difficult to reſtrain his courſe, and goes on with the more headlong violence. *He could not but deſcribe* the birth and character of Scanderbeg, *previous* to his wars with the Turks. *He could not but deſcribe* the family and life of him, who *occaſioned* the ſecond war of the Hungarians and Poles with the Turks. *He could not but deſcribe* the family of him, who *conducted* the Poles and Hungarians in both theſe wars; his life before the defeat; even his life *after* it; and even his very *ſon's* too. And he has thus clapped a large and coloured *badge* upon the patched mantle of his hiſtory, that ſerves to mark *its* poverty, and *his* diſtreſs, to every eye. There are therefore only four articles out of ſixteen in this chapter, that have any juſt connection with it; the firſt, concerning Conſtantinople; and the three laſt, concerning the acceſſion of Conſtantine to the throne, the embaſſies which he ſent, and the ſtate of his court. Three even of theſe are hardly to be reckoned, among the ‘ moſt important circumſtances’ of the decline and fall of the empire. But the intermediate points, are entirely the very wantonneſs and whimſicalneſs of digreſſion.

---

[1] P. 445.

[2] p. 445.

[3] p. 449.

[4] p. 454.

‘ Voltaire—admires le philoſophe Turc; would ‘ he have beſtowed the ſame praiſe on a Chriſtian ‘ prince, for retiring to a monaſtery? In his way, ‘ Voltaire was a bigot, an intolerant bigot[1].’ We have produced this paſſage, in order to honour the fairneſs of it. It is indeed an aſtoniſhing proof of fairneſs, in Mr Gibbon. It is a vivid flaſh of ingenuouſneſs, breaking through the deep gloom of his anti-chriſtian prejudices. And we therefore behold it with wonder, and mark it with applauſe. But it is the more aſtoniſhing, when we conſider the character to be equally adapted to Mr. Gibbon himſelf, as to Voltaire. The keen atmoſphere of ſeverity, which continually wraps Mr. Gibbon round when he ſpeaks of Judaiſm and of Chriſtianity; ſhews clearly the inclement rigour of his ſpirit towards them. The ſaucy ſtrain of authority too, with which he preſumes to dictate upon points of divinity; to penetrate with a glance, through all the folds of the moſt complicated doctrines; and to decide in an inſtant upon myſteries, that he has never familiariſed to his mind; marks plainly that high conceit and overweening confidence of opinion, which always forms the ſtuff and ſubſtance of a perſecutor. And the imperious tone of inſolence with which he ſpeaks of divines, even in their own province; men likely to have as good talents from nature, as any infidel in the kingdom; men, ſure to improve them in the buſineſs of their own profeſſion, by the general habits of a ſcholaſtick education, and by their particular attention to their profeſſional ſtudies; and men, actually ſhining in every department of ſcience, and peculiarly eminent in their own, as all the world can witneſs: is not merely to inſult the common-ſenſe of mankind, but to betray the violence of the inquiſitor under the moderation of the philoſopher; beneath the gown and furs of religious apathy, to diſcloſe the flame-coloured veſt of perſecution; and to prove Mr. Gibbon 'in *his* 'way,' to be equally with Voltaire in *his*, 'a bigot, 'an intolerant bigot.'

---

[1] P. 442.

Chapter ELEVENTH

or ſixty-eighth.——In this are the character of Mahomet II. emperour of the Turks, 464—466; his reign, 466—468; his unfriendlineſs towards the Roman empire, 468—469; his avowal of intended hoſtilities, 469—470; the heſitating conduct of the empire, 470—471; the provoking and hoſtile behaviour of the Turks, 471—473; the preparations of the Turks for the ſiege of Conſtantinople, 473—475; the great cannon, 475—477; the preparations of the Greeks for the defence of Conſtantinople, 477—478; Mahomet advancing and beginning the ſiege, 478; the forces of the Turks, 478—479; thoſe of the Greeks 479—480; the emperour having previouſly ſought for aid from the Weſt, by an offered union of the churches, 480—481; a Latin prieſt that officiated at St. Sophia's, having raiſed a great ferment among the Greeks, 481—483; the behaviour of the Greeks in the firſt part of the ſiege, 484; that of the Turks, 484—485; the effect of the Turkiſh batteries, 485; the advance of the Turks to the ditch, 485—486; their attempt to fill the ditch baffled, 486; the Turks attempting mines, but again baffled, 486; other expedients tried by them, 486—487; a breach made, but the Turks beat off for the day, 487; at night the breach built up again, 487; ſome veſſels breaking through the whole Turkiſh fleet, and bringing ſuccours, 487—490; Mahomet inclining to diſcontinue the ſiege, but reſolving upon another effort, 490; tranſporting his navy over land into the harbour, 491; attacking the wall of the city there, 492; the city reduced to diſtreſs, 492; being in diſſenſions, 493; the Turks preparing to give the aſſault, 493—495; the Greeks preparing for the expected aſſault of the morning, 495—496; the aſſault given, 496—498; the Turks gaining the walls, 498—499;

—499; the emperour ſlain, 499—500; the Turks entering the city, 500; the confuſion of the inhabitants, 500—501; the Greeks made captives, 502; their treatment, 502—503; the pillage of the city; 504—505; Mahomet entering into it, 505—507; his behaviour 507—508; his repeopling and adorning the city, 508—510; the future hiſtory of the Imperial family to its extinction, 511—514; a reſolution made in the Weſt for a cruſade againſt the Turks, but ending in nothing, 514—516; even though Mahomet invades Italy, 516—517. In this intereſting chapter, we meet with little of that everlaſting diſgrace of Mr. Gibbon's chapters, the impertinence and abſurdity of digreſſions. There is ſo little, that I ſhall not notice it. And I am happy to cloſe the *actual* narrative of the eaſtern empire, in a chapter ſo juſtly connected with the hiſtory, and forming ſuch a regular concluſion to it.

Falſe language. 'I *regret* the map or plan' [he ſhould have ſaid, 'I regret the *want of* the map or 'plan'] 'which Tournefort ſent to the French miniſter of the marine[1].' 'To *approve*' [he ſhould have ſaid, 'to *make proof of*'] 'their patience and 'long-ſuffering[2].' 'That Conſtantinople would 'be the *term* of the Turkiſh conqueſts[3].' I could 'wiſh—to prolong the *term* of one night[4].' 'The 'Greeks, now driven from the *vantage ground*,' meaning the top of the walls[5]. 'The *term* of the 'hiſtoric labours of John Sagredo[6].'

---

[1] p. 469.
[2] p. 470.
[3] p. 490.
[4] p. 491.
[5] p. 499.
[6] p. 517.

I have noticed before the mean and vulgar ſpite of Mr. Gibbon, againſt the Jews. It breaks out remarkably again, in this chapter. 'What uſe or 'merit,' he ſays concerning a Turkiſh emperor, who was learning *Chaldaic* with ſome other languages; 'could recommend to the ſtateſman or 'ſcholar, *the uncouth dialect of his Hebrew ſlaves*'?[1] The ſpite of Mr. Gibbon here is pure frenzy. But let me now aſk at the cloſe, What is the cauſe of this marked reſentment againſt the Jews, that runs through his whole hiſtory? I naturally attributed it at firſt, to that union of character and of intereſt, which Judaiſm has the honour to ſhare with Chriſtianity. Yet, on reviſing the whole, I ſee the reſentment is too violent, to be merely the reſult of ſuch a *collateral* connection. Something more operative than *any* principle of unbelief, muſt have occaſioned it. I therefore believe it to be this. Mr. Gibbon, I have other reaſons for thinking, has been ſufficiently acquainted with the *uſurious* part of the modern Iſraelites, *to have ſuffered ſome of their uſual deeds of oppreſſion in his own perſon.* The feeling of this is conſtantly floating upon his mind, I ſuppoſe, and is conſtantly giving a pungency to his ſpeculations of diſlike. And this has united with his principles in the *preſent* inſtance, I believe, to work him up into a frenzy of illiterate fanaticiſm, againſt the whole race.

Yet we ſee in this chapter a ſtroke of ingenuouſneſs, that ought to be ranked with the remarkable one before. ‘ Theſe annals,’ he ſays concerning the Turkiſh annals of Cantemir, ‘ *unleſs we are* ‘ *ſwayed by antichriſtian prejudices*, are far leſs valuable than the Greek [1].’ This is another flaſh of ingenuouſneſs, not ſo ſtrong and vivid as the former, but very ſimilar to it. The ſtroke of *this* lightning too, I believe, is equally with the force of *that* directed at the head of Voltaire. Mr. Gibbon appears to have conceived a moſt *un-brotherly* hatred, for an hiſtorian who is very like himſelf, lively, abſurd, a falſifier, and an infidel. He is not ſuch an impertinent digreſſor as Mr. Gibbon, I apprehend; and Mr. Gibbon, I preſume, is not ſuch a ſuperficialiſt in hiſtory as he. Mr. Gibbon therefore had *once*, I know, a very natural ſympathy for the hiſtorical character of Voltaire. Yet he has *now* a pointed averſion to him. ‘ See Voltaire——,’ he ſays in this very chapter: ‘ *he was ambitious of uni-* ‘ *verſal monarchy*; and *the poet* frequently aſpires to ‘ the *name* and *ſtyle* of an *aſtronomer*, a *chymiſt*, &c [2].’ In another page he adds, that ‘ the *pious* zeal of ‘ Voltaire is *exceſſive*, and even *ridiculous* [3].’ But how nicely does Mr. Gibbon again daſh out the very portrait of himſelf, in this ſecond character of Voltaire! ‘ He’ too is ‘ ambitious of univerſal monarchy; ‘ and *the digreſſor* frequently aſpires to the name ‘ and ſtyle of an aſtronomer, a chymiſt, &c.;’ and, very frequently too, ‘ the *pious* zeal of *Mr. Gibbon* ‘ is exceſſive, and even ridiculous.’ So juſtly has

---

[1] p. 465.

---

[1] p. 471.

[2] p. 476.

[3] p. 495.

Mr. Gibbon given us his own face, in his angry attempts to draw the deformed one of Voltaire! This vain old man of Ferney, the perpetual prater of infidelity to his numerous viſitants, had ſhewn ſome diſreſpect to Mr. Gibbon (I ſuppoſe) during his *laſt* retreat into Switzerland, had ſtung his pride, and had provoked his choler. And Mr Gibbon himſelf becomes half a Chriſtian at times, we ſee, in mere oppoſition to Voltaire. Such are the principles and practices, of theſe *mock-doctors* in philoſophy! But let it alſo be obſerved, that Mr. Gibbon's animoſity is as *prudent*, as it is ſtrong. He attacks not Voltaire in this bold manner, till he comes near to the *concluſion* of his work. And Voltaire, as well as Dr. Johnſon, was *dead*; before the hero preſumed to aſſault him. Such is the gallantry of a writer, who would *crouch* before the living lion, and *trample upon* the dead one!

Contradictions. Text. Mahomet 'removed the 'cauſe of ſedition, by the *death*, the *inevitable* death, 'of *his infant brothers*[1].' Note. 'Calapin, *one* of '*theſe royal infants*, was *ſaved from his cruel brother*.' What was un-avoidable is actually avoided, and what was dead is raiſed to life again.——Mr. Gibbon very properly appeals, in oppoſition to the ſcepticiſm and chemiſtry of Voltaire, to a ſingular fact in Baron de Tott's Memoirs. Yet, when he has done this in the note and text, he adds finally to the note thus: 'but that adventurous traveller '*does not poſſeſs* the art of *gaining our confidence*[2].'

---

[1] P. 467.

[2] p. 476.

And Mr. Gibbon thus countermines himſelf.—— ‘ His ſon,’ Mr. Gibbon tells us concerning a youth, whom the Turkiſh emperour wanted to abuſe unnaturally; ‘ ——preferred death to infamy, and ‘ was ſtabbed by the royal lover[r].’ The note *at firſt* confirms this *peremptory* account. ‘ See Phranza,’ it ſays concerning the very father of this youth; ‘ his expreſſions are poſitive.’ He then quotes them. And, after all, he ſays thus, ‘ yet ‘ he could only learn from report the bloody or ‘ impure ſcenes, that were acted in the dark receſſes ‘ of the ſeraglio.’ Like Sampſon, blind in his ſtrength, he is tugging at the very pillars that protect himſelf, and going to tear down the edifice upon his own head.

We have now purſued the hiſtory of the eaſtern empire, to its final extinction in the reduction of Conſtantinople by the Turks. Yet, to our ſurpriſe, we find *Mr. Gibbon*'s hiſtory of it *not* compleated. His tragedy is ended, but he claps an epilogue to the tail of it. He has no leſs than THREE chapters of hiſtory more. But what *can* he find to ſay upon the ſubject, after ſo many digreſſions to the right and left, and with ſuch a ſweeping concluſion to the whole? This Appian way, having run many a league, broad and lofty, the admiration of numbers, and the theme of all; but more conſpicuous than uſeful, a monument more of vanity and oſtentation in the conſtructor, than of ſervice and benefit to the world; and having turned aſide repeatedly in its progreſs, to take in towns and to traverſe regions, that were *not* in its *natural* line, and are now deſerted by all who purſue *that*; at laſt loſes itſelf near the end of its courſe, by plunging into the body of a great bog. 'The final extinction,' ſays Mr. Gibbon, 'of the two laſt dynaſties which have reigned in 'Conſtantinople, *ſhould* terminate the decline and 'fall of the Roman empire in the Eaſt [1].' It *ſhould*, but it *will* not. For in the *very next* paragraph he goes, to the 'grief and terror of Europe,' upon the loſs of Conſtantinople. 'As I am now,' he *adds* in another page, '*taking* an *everlaſting farewell* of the 'Greek empire;' he ſubjoins a ſhort note concerning ſome of his authors [2]. And, after an 'everlaſting farewell' of his ſubject, what *can* even this univerſal gleaner find to collect? He finds matter, that muſt ſurpriſe every reader. It thoroughly aſtoniſhed me, uſed as I was to the rambling genius of his hiſtory, when I firſt beheld it. Much as I have dwelt upon his ſtrange excurſions before, and much as I prepared myſelf for a continuance or an enlargement of them, I did not expect ſuch a wildgooſe excurſion as this. Nor will the reader be leſs ſurprized, when I tell him what it is. He cannot poſſibly conjecture. And he muſt look, and ſtare, and wonder, when he hears. 'Nor ſhall I diſmiſs the 'preſent work,' ſays Mr. Gibbon, as he firſt diſcloſes this amazing *codicil* to his long *will*; 'till I 'have *reviewed* the *ſtate* and *revolutions* of the Ro-

---

[r] p. 503.

---

[1] P. 511. [2] p. 517.

'MAN CITY,' meaning Rome, the late capital of the late empire of the Weſt, the hiſtory of which was terminated in the reduction of the capital, at the cloſe of the *third* volume; 'which' city of Rome 'acquieſced under the dominion of the popes, *about* '*the ſame time* that Conſtantinople was enſlaved 'by the Turkiſh arms[1].' The poor, feeble, and petty pretence, for *tacking-on* ſuch a hiſtory to the hiſtory preceding, is merely, we ſee; that the *main point* of it is almoſt *coincident in time*, with the concluding point of the other. Never perhaps did digreſſion attempt to cover its wantonneſs, with ſuch thin and ragged ſhreds before. Yet with theſe does Mr. Gibbon go on, through a cumbrous epilogue of no leſs than *one hundred and twenty-eight* pages in quarto. I ſhall therefore excuſe myſelf, from reviewing theſe chapters as I have reviewed the others. I ſhall only give my uſual abſtract of each, that my readers may not take my words for this enormous and exorbitant digreſſion, but may ſee it themſelves; and that they may not comprehend it merely in general, but mark it in all its full and affecting detail. The *contradictions*, the *ribaldry*, and the *miſtakes*, I ſhall paſs over entirely. For who can ſtop to count the ſtars, when a large meteor is ſtreaming before his eyes?

---

[1] P. 519.

In Chapter the TWELFTH,

or ſixty-ninth, we ſee the French and German emperours of Rome, 519—520; the turbulence of the Romans towards them, 520—521; the authority of the popes in Rome, 521—523; the turbulence of the Romans towards *them* alſo, 523—526; particular inſtances of this, 526—528; the general character of the Romans at this period, 528—529; a revolt at Rome, 529—532; the revolters reduced, 532—533; the old republican government revived in part, 533—535; the capitol fortified, 535—536; the coinage of money given to the ſenate, 536—537; the præfect of the city appointed by the ſenate and the people, 537—538; the number and choice of the ſenate, 538—539; the office of ſenator of Rome, 539—540; an account of one, Brancaleone, 540—541; of another, Charles of Anjou, 541—542; of another, Pope Martin IVth, 542; of another, Emperor Lewis of Bavaria, 542; the addreſs of Rome to one of the German emperours, 542—544; another addreſs to another emperour, 544—545; the reply of the latter, 545—546; his march to Rome in favour of the pope, 546; his beſieging Rome, and being baffled, 546—547; the wars of the Romans with the neighbouring towns, 547—549; the election of the popes by the ſenate and people, 550; by the cardinals alone, 550—551; the inſtitution of the conclave, 551—552; the people claiming a right to elect, 552—553;

but finally giving it up, 553; the abſence of the popes from Rome, 553—555; their tranſlation of the holy ſee to Avignon, 555—557; the inſtitution of the jubilee, 557—560; the nobles or barons of Rome, 560—561; the family of Leo, &c. 561—562; of the Colonna, 562—565; and of the Urſini, 565—566. This chapter of near *forty pages*, is obviouſly upon the face of the abſtract, almoſt as abrupt as it is digreſſional, and as frivolous as it is devious.

In Chapter the THIRTEENTH

or ſeventieth, we have an account of Petrarch, 567—570; his poetic coronation at Rome, 570—571; birth, character, and patriotic deſigns of one Rienzi at Rome, 572—574; his aſſuming the government of Rome, 574—576; his taking the title of tribune, 576; his new regulations, 576—578; the freedom and proſperity of Rome under him, 578—580; his being reſpected in Italy, &c. 580—581; his vices and follies, 581—583; his being knighted and crowned, 583—585; the riſing envy of the people againſt him, 585; the nobles conſpiring againſt him, 585—586; his ſeizing, condemning, pardoning, and rewarding them, 586—587; their riſing in arms againſt him out of the city, 587; attempting to enter it, but beaten off, 588; Rienzi alienating the people more, 588—589; being excommunicated by the pope, and abdicating the government, 590; feuds again at Rome, 590—591;

again a revolt, 591; Rienzi's return to power, 591; his adventures after he had abdicated, 591—593; his being made ſenator of Rome, 593; his conduct, 593—594; his being maſſacred in a tumult, 594—595; Petrarch's inviting and upbraiding the emperour Charles IV. 595—596; his requeſting the popes to return to Rome, 596—597; their return, 597; their leaving Rome again, and finally returning to it, 597—599; a pope and anti-pope, 599—601; a ſchiſm, 601; calamities of Rome, 601—602; negotiations for union, 603—604; the ſchiſm inflamed, 604—605; at laſt healed, 605—606; the coinage of money reſumed by the popes, 606—607; the laſt revolt of Rome, 607; laſt coronation of a German emperour at Rome, 608; the government and laws of Rome under the popes, 608—610; a conſpiracy againſt the popes, 610—612; but cruſhed, 612; laſt diſorders of the nobles of Rome, 612—613; the popes acquiring the abſolute dominion of Rome, 613—615; and the nature of the eccleſiaſtical government of Rome, 616—618. This chapter of more than *fifty pages*, is merely a military cheſt of the old Romans, a paymaſter's hoard of *braſs farthings*. The only parts, that can attract our attention at all, are the internal convulſions of Rome. But Rome is now ſo inſignificant in itſelf, and become ſo from being lately ſo ſignificant; that, though its diſſenſions are nearly on as large a ſcale as thoſe, which embroiled its infant ſtate, yet they are nothing to the mind, in this its ſecond infancy. And after all the grand events, that have been brought into the compaſs of this hiſtory, like the wild beaſts into the pit of a Roman amphitheatre; ſome from the neighbouring regions, moſt from the diſtant and ſequeſtered parts of the globe, and all to exhibit themſelves in their boldeſt attitudes before us; the ſquabbles of a town in Italy, that had ſome ages before been the capital of the world, had then become the capital of the Weſt, and was now merely the capital of a diſtrict, are little better to the raiſed conceptions of the reader, than the diſputes of the *ruffs* and the *reeves* among the birds.

In Chapter the FOURTEENTH

or ſeventy-firſt, is a view of Rome from the capitol in the fourteenth century, 620 - 621; an account of the ruins two hundred years before, 622—623; one of four cauſes of their deſtruction, 623—626; another, 626—628; another, 628—632; another, 632—635; the Coliſeum, 635—637; the games of Rome in it, 637—639; its injuries, 639—640; the ignorance and barbariſm of the Romans, 640—643; the reſtoration and ornaments of the city, 643—645; and the final concluſion of the work, 645—646. This chapter of *forty-ſix* pages, is digreſſion rioting in its own digreſſiveneſs, digreſſion mounting upon the ſhoulders of digreſſion, and exposing its general abſurdity the more by its particular exceſs. And it ſerves with a moſt admirable congruity of folly, to put a finiſhing cloſe to this ſtrange digreſſion, and to reduce it to a point of abſurdity,

ſurdity, which all ſhall ſee and all ſhall acknowledge.

In reviewing the whole work before, we have frequently been obliged to ſtop, and pauſe, and reflect; to interrogate ourſelves what we were reading, to recur in our minds to the title and preface of the whole, and to compare the current pages with both. Had we not done ſo, we ſhould have been loſt, like the author, in the progreſſive labyrinth of facts, opinions, and remarks. So, we believe, have many of Mr. Gibbon's readers been. They have glided down the ſtream of the hiſtory, turned in with it to the right, then turned out to the left, doubled this point, and rounded that; without reflecting on the promiſed direction of their voyage, and without conſidering the actual tendency of their motions. They muſt have been ſtartled at length however, to find themſelves ſo wide of the line expected by themſelves, and ſo diſtant from the end to which they propoſed to go; ſtill turning round new points, ſtill running down new reaches, and ſtill diverting from the main channel of the river. But, though ſtartled, they have been overborne; perſuaded that their conductor was rambling with them, yet not preſuming to rely upon their own judgment; ſtifling their perſuaſions with their modeſty, believing againſt aſſurance, and confiding againſt conviction. And, after all their circumnavigations; when they were arrived at the very ground, to which their views had been ſo long and ſo mortifyingly directed; and when they had even moored faſt at the very wharf, to which they were going, and were now to terminate all their diſappointments, by ſtepping upon the land; to find their captain throw off the faſtening in an additional fit of wantonneſs, to ſet away with them again, and to carry them round ſome of the very capes, which they had *repeatedly* doubled before, merely that they might ſee, in what condition they were ſince they viſited them *laſt*; is ſuch an enormity of wantonneſs, ſuch a *ſuperfœtation* of impertinence, as muſt make even the moſt drunken of his admirers to ſtare with aſtoniſhment.

All indeed ariſes from Mr. Gibbon's *redundancy* of ideas. He feels them continually overflowing upon him. He feels his brooks ſwelling into rivers, his rivers widening into ſeas, and his ſeas expanding into an ocean. And the ſame organization of mind, which, unchecked by judgment, made him a wild infidel; uncontroulable from indulgence, renders him as wild a digreſſor. He cannot confine his thoughts within any circumſcription of order; or reduce them under any diſcipline of propriety. He has *therefore* rambled through hiſtory, with all the excentricity of one, who

> Is of *imagination* all compact.
> * * * * *
> *Th' hiſtorian's* eye, in a fine frenzy rowling,
> Has glanc'd from heav'n to earth, from earth to heav'n.
> * * * * *
> Such tricks hath ſtrong *imagination!*

But it concludes with one trick, that greatly exceeds all the reſt. We have ſeen the two empires of Eaſt and Weſt, after a tedious illneſs and a lingering death, ſucceſſively buried under the earth. The weſtern we have particularly buried, ſome nine or ten centuries ago. Yet, to our amazement, we are now ſet by Mr. Gibbon to dig into the grave of the latter, to hunt for the poor and periſhing remains of it, and to collect the little handful of its aſhes from their old repoſitory. The modern hiſtory of Rome is placed before us, *becauſe* we have had the ancient. We are even to take Mr. Gibbon for our *Ciceroni*, and make the antiquary's tour of Rome; *becauſe* we have been reading its ancient hiſtory. Juſt ſo, in writing the annals of a king, *becauſe* 'a man may fiſh with the worm that hath 'eat of the king, and eat of the fiſh that hath fed 'of that worm;' a mad Hamlet would 'ſhew you, 'how the king,' after he was dead, 'went a pro'greſs through the guts of a beggar.' But no words can fully expoſe, the aſtoniſhing deviouſneſs of ſuch a digreſſion as this. Never, I believe, has any thing like it been attempted before, in the world of hiſtory. It is certainly a flight beyond the moon. And it marks in the ſtrongeſt colours, the progreſs of imagination in the mind, and the operation of digreſſion in the hiſtory, of Mr. Gibbon; of imagination kindling with the motion of its own ideas, and of digreſſion growing licentious from the exerciſe of its own liberty; both riſing gradually from a leſſer folly to a greater, adding impertinence to impertinence,

nence, and accumulating abſurdity upon the head of abſurdity; till they have cloſed at laſt, in a full conſummation of enormity and wildneſs.

CHAPTER THE FIFTH.

I HAVE thus reviewed the three laſt volumes of this hiſtory, with a circumſtantiality, which has hardly ever been uſed upon a work before; but which the preſent, from its peculiar quality, demanded of me. And I am now to draw my concluſions, from the whole.

This is a work of a very extraordinary nature. It is not in the common rank of publications, aiming at a moderate ſhare of reputation, and content to reſt in a mediocrity of character. It muſt either be highly cenſured or ſtrongly praiſed, or praiſed and cenſured with an equal degree of energy. It is indeed a production, that has a thouſand beauties and a thouſand blemiſhes. It ſhews a large and comprehenſive range of erudition, a range amazingly comprehenſive and large. But the author is even more oſtentatious of his learning, than Milton himſelf; and, even oftener than Milton, clouds and obſcures what he writes by it. His notes are ſo frequent in themſelves, and ſo full of foreign matter, that the reader is perpetually drawn off from the ſubject of the text, and his mind is diſtracted in an endleſs variety; being toſſed backwards and forwards, between hiſtorical narrative and critical obſervations, the deeds of the actors on the *ſtage* above, and the characters of the writers in the ‘ cellarage’ below. And all forms ſuch a complication of incongruous parts, that the one counteracts the other in its impreſſion upon the mind, and the claſhing of both deſtroys half the energy of either. The language of Mr. Gibbon alſo, is frequently harſh from the foreign idioms, and from the affectation of vigour, in it. The harſhneſs is, that of one of Dr. Johnſon's diſſertations, utterly incompatible with the native eaſe and the familiar dignity of hiſtorical language. The meaning too is repeatedly obſcure. This ariſes generally from the quick and ſhort alluſiveneſs of it. Mr. Gibbon's ſtyle thus becomes like Tacitus's, too rapid to be clear, and too fantaſtically infolded to be readily intelligible. Yet a much more formidable failing than theſe, has evidently been detected before. The ſelf-contradictorineſs of Mr. Gibbon is very wonderful. In diſtant, in adjoining parts of his hiſtory, it is too apparent. And the oppoſition of the notes to the text, and of one part of the note or of the text to the reſt, are ſtriking proofs of his confuſedneſs of judgment. We have ſeen his poſitions fighting, like ſo many gladiators, before us; and deſtroying one another.

But we are ſtill more diſguſted in reading this work, with the length and the frequency of its digreſſions. Two thirds of the whole, we may fairly ſay, are quite foreign to it. The digreſſions too continue to grow in length, and to riſe in abſurdity, to the very end. Indeed they are ſo abſurd and ſo long at laſt, that hardly any images in nature can fully repreſent them, to the imagination of our readers. And one of the *ſatellites* of Saturn, relinquiſhing its maſter-orb, and running the round of the ſolar ſyſtem; or the moon, deſerting her duty of attendance upon our earth, and loſing herſelf in the wilderneſs of ſpace; can alone image forth the ſtrange excurſiveneſs of Mr. Gibbon in hiſtory. But the grand fault of the whole, I believe, is its unfaithfulneſs. There is no dependence to be made, I apprehend, upon any one reference, or even any one citation, in it. This I have ſhewn ſufficiently before, I think, by ſome ſpecial inſtances. It could not be expected, that in an examination of this nature I could be more particular. Yet I have done full enough, to tempt the curioſity or to urge the zeal of others. And I doubt not, but the more Mr. Gibbon is followed cloſely through all his quotations and references, he will the more be found either negligently, or diſhoneſtly, doubling in them.

Theſe are broad ſpots upon this hiſtorical ſun. They require no critical teleſcope to view them. They come forward to the naked eye. But the laſt, from its very nature, is fatal to the whole. And, as Mademoiſelle de Keralio has very juſtly obſerved, 'on peut etre *eloquent*, on peut avoir un ſtyle '*ſeduiſant* et *noble*, mais *n'eſt pas hiſtorien.*' Mr. Gibbon's hiſtory, therefore, is only an elegant froſtpiece, the production of a night; which glitters to the eye, plays upon the fancy, and captivates the judgment for a ſhort period; but diſſolves in the frailty of its fine materials, and fades away into air, as ſoon as the ſun begins to ſhine upon it.

But what are theſe faults, to the wickedneſs that pervades the whole? Obſcenity ſtains it through its very ſubſtance. This muſt diſcredit it with all, who love modeſty, who cultivate a ſpirit of elegance in their ſouls and of delicacy in their language, and are not compleatly vulgarized by their animal inſtincts. In his preface to theſe volumes Mr. Gibbon very truly informs us, that he is 'now deſcending into the vale of years;' and the volumes themſelves aſſure us, that he is deſcending with all the groſs laſciviouſneſs of unbluſhing youth about him. How full muſt be the fountain of impurity in the heart, when the ſtream is foaming and frothing ſo much through the page? Yet even this bold note of wantonneſs is exceeded, by the daring tone of infidelity. Mr. Gibbon comes forward with all the rancour of a renegado, againſt Chriſtianity. He tramples upon it at firſt, with the cloven-foot of Heatheniſm. He dungs upon it at laſt, from the dirty tail of Mahometaniſm. And literary abſurdity, however glaring, even practical profligacy, however flaming, are both loſt for a moment in the ſenſe of this volcanick eruption of antichriſtian impiety.

The friends of literature, then, may equally triumph and lament, at a work like this. They may triumph, when, with the uſual perfunctorineſs of criticiſm, they conſider the wide range of reading in it, the ſplendour of the ſentiments, the depth of the reflections, and the vivacity of the language. But they muſt lament, when they come to ſcrutinize it with a ſtricter eye, to mark the harſh and the falſe language, the diſtraction occaſioned by the parade of reading, the obſcurity in the meaning, the contradictorineſs of the parts, the endleſs labyrinth of digreſſions, and the careleſs or wilful unfaithfulneſs in the narrative. The friends of religion alſo, muſt grieve with a juſter ſorrow, over the deſperate profligacy of all. But let not one friend to religion be weak enough to fear. There is not a particle of formidableneſs in the thouſand ſtrokes, that this blaſted arm of infidelity has been laying upon the ſhield of Chriſtianity. That ſhield is the immortal ægis of wiſdom. Againſt ſuch a cover, if we are not ſcared with the glitter, we need not to dread the edge, of Mr. Gibbon's ſword. Mr. Gibbon is only angry at Chriſtianity, becauſe Chriſtianity frowns upon him. He has been long endeavouring to ſhake off the terrours, which his Chriſtian education has impreſſed upon him; but he cannot do ſo.

> 'He ſcorns them, yet they awe him.'

He is therefore acting towards Chriſtianity, like a bull caught in a net; making every deſperate effort, to break the cords that ſtill encompaſs him; and ſtraining every nerve in an agony of exertion, to burſt away into the undiſquieted wilds of animal enjoyment. And I think I cannot better conclude my review of his hiſtory, than by applying to him this character in Milton; as, equally in the praiſe and in the cenſure, truly deſcriptive of him.

——— On th' other ſide up roſe
Belial, in *act* more *graceful* and *humane:*
A *fairer* perſon loſt not heaven; he ſeem'd
For *dignity* compos'd and *high exploit*,
But all was *falſe* and *hollow*; though his *tongue*
Dropt manna, and could make the *worſe* appear
The *better* reaſon, to *perplex* and *daſh*
Matureſt counſels; for his *thoughts* were *low*,
To *vice* induſtrious, but to *noble* deeds
Timorous and *ſlothful*; yet he *pleaſed* the *ear*,
And with *perſuaſive accent* thus began.

FINIS.

The following Books, written by Mr. Whitaker, are ſold by J. Murray, No. 32, Fleet Street, London.

MARY QUEEN of SCOTS VINDICATED. By John Whitaker, B. D. and Rector of Ruan-Lanyhorne, Cornwall. The ſecond edition, greatly enlarged and corrected, 8vo. 3 vols. price One Guinea in boards.

‡†‡ If the Author has been able to execute his own intention, this work will be found to contain a full examination of all the charges that have been latterly brought forward againſt the unfortunate MARY; and a complete refutation of them from evidence of the moſt unqueſtionable authority.

II. The HISTORY of MANCHESTER, with plates, 2 vols. 4to. by the ſame Author, price 1l. 16s. boards.

†‡† Theſe volumes contain the Roman, the Roman-Britiſh, and the Saxon Period of our Hiſtory.

III. The GENUINE HISTORY of the BRITONS aſſerted againſt Mr. Macpherſon, 8vo. price 5s. bound.

Where may be had the following Hiſtorical and other Performances.

1. An HISTORICAL VIEW of the ENGLISH GOVERNMENT; from the Settlement of the Saxons in Britain to the Acceſſion of the Houſe of Stewart. By John Millar, Eſq. Profeſſor of Law in the Univerſity of Glaſgow. The ſecond edition, 4to. price 18s. in boards.

2. ANNALS of SCOTLAND, from the Acceſſion of Robert I. ſurnamed Bruce, to the Acceſſion of the Houſe of Stewart. By Sir David Dalrymple, Bart. one of the Judges of the Court of Seſſion in Scotland, 4to. 2 vols. price 1l. 7s. 6d. in boards.

3. A VIEW of SOCIETY in EUROPE, in its Progreſs from Rudeneſs to Refinement; or, Enquiries concerning the Hiſtory of Law, Government, and Manners, 4to. 15s. boards. By Gilbert Stuart, LL. D.

4. An HISTORICAL DISSERTATION concerning the ANTIQUITY of the ENGLISH CONSTITUTION, 8vo. ſecond edition, 5s. bound. By the ſame.

5. HISTORY of the REFORMATION of RELIGION in SCOTLAND, 4to. 10s. 6d. boards. By the ſame.

6. ORATIONS of LYSIAS and ISOCRATES, tranſlated from the Greek; with ſome Account of their Lives, and a Diſcourſe on the Hiſtory, Manners, and Character of the Greeks,

from the Concluſion of the Peloponneſian War, to the Battle of Chæronea. By John Gillies, LL. D. 4to. price 1l. 1s. in boards.

7. CAMPBELL's LIVES of the BRITISH ADMIRALS, with Maps and Cuts, brought down to 1779. Four Volumes large Octavo, price 1l. 8s. bound.

8. GAST's HISTORY of GREECE; from the Acceſſion of Alexander of Macedon till its final Subjection to the Roman Power, in one large Volume Quarto, price One Guinea in boards.

9. A VIEW OF ANCIENT HISTORY; including the Progreſs of Literature and the fine Arts. By William Rutherford, D.D. Maſter of the Academy at Uxbridge. Two Vols. large 8vo. illuſtrated with a Map of the ancient World very handſomely engraved, price 14s. in boards.

N. B. In compoſing a Work originally intended for the Inſtruction of Youth, the Author has ſtudied to ſelect his Materials from the moſt authentic Sources; to ſeparate the Region of Fable from that of Hiſtory; and to ſuggeſt ſuch Views of human Affairs, as ſerve not only to enlighten the Mind, but to form the Heart to Virtue, and inſpire Principles of true Religion.

10. TRAVELS ROUND THE WORLD, in the Years 1767, 1768, 1769, 1770, 1771. By Monſieur de Pages, Captain in the French Navy, Chevalier of the Royal and Military Order of St. Louis, and correſponding Member of the Academy of Sciences at Paris. Tranſlated from the French. Illuſtrated with a Frontiſpiece repreſenting a Scene in the Deſert of Arabia. Two Vols. 8vo. price 8s. in boards.

☞ Theſe intereſting Travels, among various and important information, contain the beſt account which has yet tranſpired reſpecting the actual condition of the Spaniſh Weſt Indies, over which the Court of Spain has long been ſolicitous to caſt a myſterious and impenetrable veil. The ſpirited, intelligent, and philanthropic narrator was in habits of particular friendſhip with the philoſophic and learned Buffon; and he ſeems indeed highly to have deſerved the eſteem of ſo diſtinguiſhed a genius, by his moral qualities, as well as by his ingenious, lively and penetrating mind.

11. The HISTORY of ENGLAND from the earlieſt Times to the Death of George the IId. By Dr. Goldſmith. Octavo, 3 vols, 1l. 4s. bound.

12. ORIGINAL ANECDOTES of PETER the GREAT, collected from the Converſation of ſeveral Perſons of Diſtinction at Peterſburgh and Moſcow. By Mr. Stœhlin, Member of the Imperial Academy at Peterſburgh. Octavo, price 6s. in boards.

00032390

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 25 June, 2016